

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

MARCH, 1869.

ART. I. — CHRISTIANITY AND PAGANISM.

WHAT is the essential difference between Christianity and the other religions of the world? How shall we account for that peculiar and wonderful influence which it has exerted over the life of mankind? These questions have already received a vast number of very unsatisfactory answers, and now, more than ever before, they are engrossing the attention of all thoughtful minds.

To answer them, we must first gain a precise comprehension of pagan civilization, or, rather, of two main tendencies to be traced in its development. One tendency is subjective, turning the mind inward upon itself, leading it to rely upon its own impulses and powers; the other is objective, turning the mind to the outer world to seek for support and guidance. And as one or the other of these tendencies may dominate, two generic types of character are formed. One is proud and self-reliant; the other is humble and reverent. One is conscious of human dignity; the other is weighed down with a sense of human weakness and unworthiness. One is filled with an energy that brooks no opposition, and chafes against every obstacle; the other is patient, submissive, and yields readily to the necessity that may be imposed upon it. One confides in its own intellectual powers; the other leans upon some external authority. The radical difference between these two types of character distinguishes not only individual

men, but races and communities of men. In particular, it is strongly marked in the different nations of the pagan world. Wherever a people has risen above the stage of barbarism, one or the other of these impulses has wholly controlled or greatly modified the development of the national life. And in every form of pagan civilization yet known, they have been unreconciled and almost unrestrained. Hence the necessary limitations of ancient civilization, and the causes of its inevitable decline. For both of these tendencies have in them elements of good; either, when pushed to an extreme, results in the maiming or else the deep corruption of the moral life. Each form of pagan civilization shows us a one-sided and fatally imperfect development. Neglecting one part, it went on abnormally developing the other, until the process culminated in the wildest and most ruinous exaggerations. Against such fatal excesses paganism could furnish no safeguard, and could offer no remedy; for it had no force outside of itself by which it could check its controlling tendency, even when some restraint was most imperiously demanded. Its fundamental law permitted of no reform, but only of a continued evolution of the original impulse into still wilder extremes and more fatal excesses; and thus a movement, begun in brilliant promise and effecting many noble results, ended at last in mere ruin and decay.

There are two nations which exhibit with especial clearness the workings of the two tendencies we have described; because each of them followed its particular line of development to its completest issue. These are Greece and India. Let us briefly examine these typical representatives of the two grand divisions of pagan civilization.

The religion of the Hindus, through all the phases of its development, was a worship of Nature, varying at different periods only in the subtilty of its conceptions. How that religion would naturally pass from the worship of the dawn or the sunset into a more cultivated worship of the Absolute One, — of an entity abstract and impersonal, comprehending all things within itself, — we cannot here describe; but, through all its variations, the essential character of the religion re-

mains unchanged. Its theology has no conception of the divine personality. It is the faith of men who have learned to seek for the divine in the universe around them, rather than in the silent witness of their own hearts.

The morality of Brahminism is of the same character as its theology. Its fundamental principle is the degradation of the moral sense and of the personality of man. There is but one universal soul, and human individuality is a mere illusion of the present. Founded upon such principles, Hindu morality has no conception of conscience; its distinctions between virtue and vice are derived only from divine revelation. So, likewise, the obligations of morality come only from without: men are to do right simply because the practice of virtue saves from punishment and leads to future happiness. Finally, virtue is not eternal or immutable, as the Greeks thought: it is simply a transient mode of nature, as merely phenomenal as color or sound. These three essential characteristics describe the Hindu system of morality, and reveal the spirit which produced it.

And so with the intellectual life of the Hindus. In the categories of Kapila, only three methods of proof are enumerated, — perception, inference, and revelation; and all other Hindu systems coincide with this. In the Hindu logic, revelation takes the place of intuition or pure reason, and this fact is the corner-stone of Brahminical philosophy. For the Hindu, the first principles of all science are to be found only in the sacred books, and to them he refers as the supreme authority. Hence come also that servile adherence to authority, that boundless credulity and implicit reverence for the past, which characterize all Hindu thought. Everywhere we see the same distrust of human nature, and the same intense longing for some external support upon which the belief may rest.

Another characteristic of Hindu thought is its idealism. We cannot here describe how the objective impulse inevitably leads the human spirit, step by step, into idealistic conceptions. Certain it is, however, that idealism is the logical development of the worship of Nature. It is the last refuge of the Hindu worshipper, who, in his search for the divine, is inevitably led

beyond the sensuous and the transitory into a universe ideal and eternal.

A necessary consequence of this idealistic spirit is the engrossment with the affairs of the future life. Hindu thought, disdainful of the present, is constantly fixed upon the realities of an unknown world. Its highest aspirations are for deliverance from the earthly; its supreme hope, the attainment of eternal repose. And this engrossment with the future has always been the incurable plague of Hindu life. It has made human life cheap and almost worthless. It has fostered a fatal indifference to all the practical interests of earthly existence.

Connected with this is the spirit of asceticism. The ascetic theory of Brahminism is complete and radical. It is not directed against the body alone. It seeks to destroy consciousness, volition, understanding,—all natural faculties; since they are parts of human individuality, that fatal illusion which separates man from the real universe of the spirit. In a word, Brahminism is a war against human nature in all its forms. It is the complete surrender of human personality, as illusory in itself, and the source of all the ills and illusions of life. Its final hope is the absorption of the individual into the Supreme Soul of the universe.

Turning now to the social organization of India, we notice two principles upon which the system appears to be founded. One is the supremacy of the spiritual power, which, being derived directly from revelation, does not permit of any doubt; the other is the repression, so far as possible, of all human individuality in social life. In India, the king is not the representative of the people or the state: he is the vicegerent of heaven. Indian government is a despotism by divine right. Under such a dominion, individual citizenship and its rights become the merest nullity. Even the right of individual property in the land is very obscurely, if at all, recognized in ancient Hindu law. Another and better known example is the institution of castes. Indeed, the caste system is by itself a most perfect expression in social life of the Hindu spirit,—a spirit which frowns upon every free impulse of the human

soul, and seeks to subordinate the individuality of man, even in the minutest details of living, to an external authority.

If we turn now to Greece, we find a system the exact counterpart of the Hindu one. Greek religion bears everywhere the impress of the free, proud, subjective spirit. Its divinities are not mere personifications of the forces of Nature, or manifestations of an abstract and impersonal Infinity; they are simply a race of immortal and invisible heroes, having the virtues, the vices, and every essential characteristic of human nature. As the Hindu had sought the divine in the outer world, so the Greek found it within the heart of man. For him the divine was but the human, freed from earthly imperfections, and gifted with transcendent powers. So in the Hellenic system of morality. It was Greece that first established the supremacy of conscience over human life,—made the moral intuitions the final arbiters in questions of right and wrong. The Hindu sought to make men better through the fear of hell and the hope of heaven; but the Greek had only the most vague and feeble conception of the retributions of a future state. In a word, the Hellenic spirit, true to the subjective impulse, bases its system of morality upon the inner life. It proclaims the Good as an eternal principle, not a transient expedient. Careless of all external authority, it installs the soul itself as, at once, the lawgiver and the judge of human life.

The same spirit prevailed in the intellectual life of the people. Greece has no official theology, no divine revelation. The idea of revelation it replaces by that of inspiration,—two ideas which, though often confounded, really lie at opposite poles of human thought. Against the Hindu principle of faith, it maintains the supremacy of reason. In place of the Oriental reverence for authority, it arouses the spirit of criticism and free inquiry. The Greek, furthermore, was the champion of moral as well as of intellectual freedom. He had no sympathy with fatalism,—the creed of the Oriental, awe-stricken by the majesty of Nature, and deaf to the voices of the human heart. In spite of certain philosophical vagaries, the old Homeric faith in human freedom never lost its hold

upon the Hellenic spirit. It never ceased to animate the poetry, the art, the religion, the public and private life, of the Grecian people.

As the tendency of Hindu thought is idealistic, so that of Greece is materialistic. The Greek contemplates the outer world only from the stand-point of practical common sense: he finds there what the senses reveal to him, and nothing more. Greek faith, wholly absorbed in the worship of a deified human nature, never pierced into that spiritual and eternal universe which Hindu Nature-worship had discovered. It had no power to carry the thought of men beyond the necessary limitation of the present: it inspired no faith in spiritual things; it taught to the human heart no lessons of the Infinite and the Eternal.

Hence came the ultimate decline of the religious sentiment among the Greeks. While by no means irreligious, the Hellenic system is always overshadowed by the possibility of becoming so. As the Hindu religion tended to superstition, the Grecian led naturally to scepticism: it carried within itself the elements of its own destruction.

More immediate results of this spirit were that worldliness and that fear of death which made Greek life so inexpressibly mournful. The Hindu faith in immortality was invincible; even the sceptical school of the Sankhya had no more doubt concerning the future life than the orthodox Vedanta. But it was the sad fate of Greece to have no faith in spiritual things, and no firm hope of the future. There is needed no other condemnation of Hellenism than the exhibition of this its primary defect. A civilization which has no hope of the future, and a religion whose final word is a lesson of despair, perish by the grace of God and for the welfare of humanity. We can only wonder at the power of that human genius which, by the formation of unrivalled political institutions, by its enchanting creations of poetry and art, by the grandeur of its moral teachings, was enabled to preserve, for so many centuries, a civilization which thus utterly fails to satisfy the inmost needs and cravings of the human heart.

The social system of Greece was the natural offspring of

that subjective spirit which believes in freedom and has faith in man; and the ultimate failure of it was the inevitable result from that one-sidedness of pagan development which we have been endeavoring to illustrate. Greece framed the ideal of popular liberty, but lacked the power to realize it in any enduring form. Before that could be done, it was needed that there should be incorporated into the popular life other elements which the subjective spirit could not supply.

Such, then, is the radical difference between the two representative civilizations of antiquity,—the Hellenic and the Hindu. It would be useless to attempt to decide concerning their relative merits; for they are the developments of the two opposite sides of our human nature. Each satisfies certain needs and aspirations of the soul which the other totally ignores. And thus each possesses elements of peculiar grandeur, which are absolutely necessary for the perfection of human life; while both, through the one-sidedness of their development, necessarily lead to the most disastrous results. If the civilization of India was more enduring, it was also less progressive; it turned men's thoughts away from the practical affairs of life into a world of reverie: it nurtured the most boundless credulity and the wildest superstitions; it inculcated the most slavish submission to the authority of the past, repressing the spirit of free inquiry, and crushing out all possibilities of intellectual improvement. On the other hand, if the civilization of Greece was more brilliant in its progress, it was also far more gloomy in its end. There are few sadder pages in human history than those which describe the utter loss of all faith in God and human-kind, the weariness of life and dread of death, the scepticism and despair, which characterized the final periods of classical civilization. And so in government. If the political ideal of the West was a nobler one than that of the Orient, it more completely failed of realization. And the most notable difference between the Hindu despotism by divine right, and the Roman despotism by right of force or usurpation, was, that the latter was rendered far more mournful by that memory of lost liberties which still remained in the popular heart.

Each form of pagan civilization, then, is essentially one-sided and imperfect. It abnormally develops one part of human nature, and paralyzes the other. But no people could remain entirely satisfied with this half-way development, especially in view of its practical results. Men grow vaguely conscious of needs which the prevailing system does not satisfy; and, in spite of every effort at repression, the other side of human nature begins to assert itself. Hence come revolts, protests, or attempted reformatations. Of these revolts, we are permitted to notice only one, but that the most memorable of all. That revolt we call Buddhism.

Buddhism organized the opposition to the prevailing system in India around two great principles. The first principle was aimed at the institution of castes, the supremacy of the priesthood, — at the practical side of the Hindu system. Buddhism teaches the absolute equality of all men, without distinction of birth. It is a doctrine of universal charity. It proclaims a free gospel, which is to be preached to all the world. In the same way, the revolt arrayed itself against the speculative part of that system. The chief aim of Brahminism had been to degrade the human personality; and against that aim Buddhism opposed the astounding doctrine of Buddha. Never has there been so wild a glorification of humanity as this. It did not simply teach, as the Greeks did, that man might ascend to the rank of the gods: it taught that he might attain a position which the gods would envy, and would in vain strive to reach. Thus it became a revolution, striking at the very roots of the prevailing system. Brahminism, in its reverence for the outer world, had utterly ignored the capabilities of human nature: Buddhism proclaimed that a man, unaided by any external power, relying only upon the resources of his own nature, might achieve the absolute sovereignty of the universe.

These, then, are the two central truths which Buddhism proclaimed in India, and they clearly display the design of the new system. It was a mighty revolt, — a grand, popular uprising against that faith which for so many centuries had dominated over Indian life, and had culminated in such

deplorable results. By its proclamation of human perfectibility and its crusade against the institution of castes, it arrayed itself directly against the prevailing system, which degraded man, and trusted only in external authority. It gave, in some sort, a response to that other side of human nature, — to that subjective spirit which had been so long repressed by the objective faith of India. And so it received the cordial support, or at least the secret favor, of the royal and military class; it was welcomed gladly by the common people, the poor, the outcasts, — by all those orders of society which had been humiliated and crushed under the rule of the Brahmins.

And yet this Buddhistic revolt failed utterly to accomplish its purpose. It wrought no real deliverance for its followers; it left the old spirit of Indian civilization just as powerful and unrestrained as before. In its two cardinal principles, it made a specious show of opposition to the old system; in reality, the antagonism was only upon the surface: at heart, the two religions were animated by a common spirit. In a word, Buddhism was a revolt, not a reform.

For instance, the doctrine that a man may become Buddha seems to be directly antagonistic to the old faith, which degraded humanity; and yet the antagonism was only superficial. The Buddhistic conception, notwithstanding its specious appearance to the contrary, as completely destroys all genuine faith in human nature as did the older doctrine. For this supreme estate of Buddha is to be attained only by the complete destruction of all desire and volition; of self-consciousness, memory, and understanding; of every faculty and energy which belong to the human soul: and when, one by one, these essential elements of the human nature have been cast aside, — when human life has faded into simple abstract being, wrapped in absolute repose and indifference to all things, — then man reaches the summit of existence. The soul gains deliverance only by the sacrifice of itself. With all its efforts at reform, Buddhism could not cast off the primal curse of Hinduism, — the doctrine that self-consciousness, volition, conscience, and all activities of the soul, are

bonds which bind us to the painful illusions of Nature, and from which we must seek deliverance as much as from the miseries of physical existence. The new theory is only the old one under a strange disguise. The opposition to the old system exhausted itself in the creation of this wild dream concerning the future, which, after all, inspires no real faith in human nature ; leaves conscience, free thought, and every native energy of the soul in as low esteem as before. Its ideal is not the development, but the annihilation, of all that which constitutes true manhood. Its dreams of deliverance are to be realized only through the sacrifice of human nature.

An equally careful analysis of the second principle will lead to the same results. And, beyond these two great rallying cries, Buddhism does not even pretend to make any radical departure from the older system. Its morality is founded upon the same false and narrow basis. Its intellectual life is cursed by the same slavish spirit ; indeed, it exhibits, in a still greater degree, that fatal distrust of reason and implicit faith in revelation which characterized Brahminism. The fatalistic sentiment is no less powerful in the new religion than in the old ; so that, in its doctrines of conscience, reason, and the will, Buddhism only reproduces the ancient system. Furthermore, it denies with equal boldness the reality of phenomenal existence, and accepts all the practical consequences of that doctrine. The morbid horror of the present life, the wild longing for deliverance, the engrossment of the soul with the affairs of the future, the intense love of the supernatural, the superstitious spirit which was never weary of framing new inventions concerning the hells and heavens of the invisible world,—all these features, especially characteristic of the Brahminical system, are reproduced with still wilder extravagance in the teachings of Buddhism. Last of all, the doctrine of metempsychosis—a doctrine so peculiar in its nature, origin, and results, that its presence alone would be sufficient to determine the character of any faith containing it—plays a more important part, if possible, in the Buddhistic faith than in the teachings of the Brahmins.

It would be instructive to consider those efforts at self-reformation which the orthodox Brahminical party made during their struggles with the Buddhists, and which led to what has been aptly called "the secondary formation of the Brahminical religion." The examination would only corroborate the conclusions already announced. The Indian people have rebelled more than once against some of the superficial features of the prevailing system, but have never been able to free themselves from its elementary spirit. Their attempts at reformation have proved to be only new phases of the original development: the doctrines which seemed so revolutionary were in reality only the old principles clothed in new disguises. In spite of all apparent antagonisms, revolts, or reformations, that peculiar tendency which develops one side of the human nature, but paralyzes the other; which fosters reverence, devotion, and a sublime faith in things eternal, but crushes out all freedom of thought, self-reliance, enterprise, and manly dignity, — has never for one moment lost its hold upon Hindu life. After more than thirty centuries of trial, the Hindu spirit has failed to draw from its own resources any principle upon which a true reform might be based, — has only been able to carry out the one-sided and abnormal development, begun so many ages ago, to still wilder and more disastrous conclusions.

On the other hand, we should find in Greece the traces of an equally earnest struggle against that subjective system which, since the days of Homer, had dominated over the popular life. We should discover a long series of attempted reformations, which sought to introduce the idealistic and reverent spirit of the East as an antidote to the materialism, the scepticism, and despair of the future, which were corroding the life of Greece. Such attempts were the labors of the Pythagoreans, of Plato, and of the Neo-Platonists. But these, and other efforts of like design, we are obliged to pass unnoticed.

All these inquiries would converge toward one conclusion. That conclusion we can afford to state again. The fundamental fact of every form of pagan civilization is the unre-

strained development of one of the two conflicting impulses of the human spirit. Paganism, whether of the East or the West, ignores, or rather crushes out, one of the two factors necessary for the formation of a perfect civilization. One impulse having gained the ascendancy, totally excludes the other, and thus, without the restraint of any counterbalancing power, pushes on to the wildest extremes and most fatal excesses. And though the constantly increasing evils of such an evolution may produce a feeling of discontent and of vague longing for reform, which finds expression in popular revolts or philosophical protests, yet these attempts accomplish nothing. Still the original movement goes on without interruption, until it ends in the imbecility and unbroken stupor of Oriental life, or in that utter disintegration and downfall which was the happier fate of paganism in the West.

The recognition of this fact, we believe to be the first step towards a true understanding of human history. The second is a corresponding study of the nature of the Christian religion. And the aim of this study will be, to find some element in that religion which will fulfil the three following conditions: First, the element must be a *constant* one: it must be one which every true Christian, of every sect, will recognize as lying at the foundation of his faith, whatever additions he may choose to make to it for the sake of his peculiar belief. Secondly, it must be a *distinctive* element, — one which shall distinguish Christianity from all other religions. Thirdly, it must be an *efficient* element, — one which shall be able to account for that peculiar influence which Christianity has exerted upon the world.

Such an element we shall not discover among the moral or theological doctrines taught by Christianity. For it has not been found possible to show, that any of these doctrines belong distinctively to the Christian religion. Nor can it be supposed, that, while these principles may have been before communicated to the world, the proper co-ordination of them into a system fitted for the needs of human life, is the essential feature of the religion. For no body of doctrine has ever formed a constant element present amid all variations

of the Christian faith. The essence, then, of Christianity is not to be found in its intellectual system. Nor indeed is any religion based upon merely intellectual formulas, for doctrine is always a secondary formation of the human spirit. The different beliefs which have divided mankind are the creations of different tendencies or impulses of the moral nature. The disputes of the philosophers and theologians, which appear to them of such transcendent importance, effect nothing: they are noteworthy only as the formal expression of a grander conflict which is going on in the heart of humanity. The history of philosophy is but a dim shadow of the history of the human heart.

We need not, then, search amid the doctrines of Christianity for the secret of its power; and, with this understanding, our search becomes an easy one. For, beyond the maze of doctrine, there is a certain spirit or impulse which is universally recognized as essential to Christian life; and that is, "Faith in Christ." All believers will admit this to be an essential part of their religion; although many, misled by the common error concerning the importance of dogma, might seek to add something to so simple a statement of their faith. But nothing further is needed. Faith in Christ is the spirit of Christianity. It is the one distinctive, constant, and efficient element for which we are seeking. Such a statement of Christianity seems a very simple and familiar one; yet a careful study of it will perhaps lead to very novel and important results.

There are two component parts of a true faith in Christ. The one of these is *the love of a personal ideal*, such as the believer finds in the life of Jesus. Christianity does not simply deliver to the world a body of moral precepts or mental formulas, by which life is to be governed: it presents a perfect type of character. It does not merely require obedience to abstract rules: it demands an absorbing love and reverence for a real person. This presentation of a perennial ideal, the love of which constitutes the beginning of religion, is altogether peculiar to Christianity. And evidently such an ideal, appealing directly to the emotions and

moral sensibilities, would be much more effective than a merely formal precept. Still, this love and reverence for a person would be, by itself, essentially imperfect and inefficient. It would continually tend to degenerate into a mere æsthetic enthusiasm, with little practical influence over life; or else, in ways which will be better understood hereafter, it would merely develop the original tendencies of the spirit, and effect no real reform of human nature. For the formation of a perfectly efficient moral power, the addition of another element is demanded. And this, happily, the cardinal principle of Christianity supplies.

For the conception of Christian faith implies, besides reverence for the ideal, the concomitant *sense of need*. This consciousness of need moulds what otherwise might have remained a sentiment of vague and fruitless admiration into an effective moral force. It is owing to the absence of this consciousness that an earnest love for a very exalted type of character often fails to exert any reformatory influence over the life. Secondly, the presence of this element gives to the conception of faith in Christ its religious aspect. Last of all, it renders possible the universality of the faith. For a mere moral or æsthetic enthusiasm depends upon the sensitiveness of the spiritual organization: it can be excited only with great difficulty, and very feebly in souls gross by nature or depraved by vicious courses. On the contrary, the sense of need can be awakened in all souls, perhaps even more easily among the degraded than among the more moral and intellectual. In these three ways, then, the consciousness of spiritual need operates. It assures to Christian faith its effectiveness as a reformatory power; attests its religious character, as distinguished from every form of moral or æsthetic enthusiasm; and, above all, it renders its reception possible by souls of every grade.

Faith in Christ, then, is made up of two factors: the love of the personal ideal, and the sense of spiritual need. And now we see in what a surprising way this division corresponds with the distinction formerly made between the controlling impulse of the East and that of the West. One

element of Christian faith answers to the spirit of normal Hellenism; the other, to that of Orientalism.

For, as we have seen, the specific aim of Hellenism is to develop a moral and æsthetic enthusiasm among the people. The Greek religion taught men to enthusiastically believe in the grandeur of human nature and the divineness of the moral intuitions; it commanded its worshippers to resolutely aspire after a certain high ideal of virtue which was placed before them. Nor was this ideal altogether an abstract one; it was, to some extent, personal, being realized, with sufficient accuracy, in the lives of the heroes of primitive times. This heroic ideal had inspired in the hearts of the people a grand enthusiasm, which was the groundwork of the national life. But the other element of the Christian principle was almost entirely wanting in Grecian character. Thus the Greek, having only the feeblest consciousness of his own deficiencies, was little disposed to admire the virtues which he lacked. And hence the Hellenic ideal was only the embodiment of the Hellenic tendencies. It was essentially one-sided and imperfect; it presented only the virtues peculiar to Grecian character, such as valor, endurance, and self-reliance; it utterly ignored those other qualities, — faith, humility, resignation, and hope, — which are equally grand, but spring from a different spirit. Moral enthusiasm, without the sense of need, could effect no reform; it served only to exaggerate the fatal tendencies of the Hellenic spirit, and to hasten forward the evolution, already begun, to its inevitable end.

If we turn now to contemplate the Oriental division of paganism, we find a similar correspondence with the other element of Christian faith. For Orientalism develops the consciousness of spiritual need, in its most absolute form. So far from teaching men to rely upon their individual efforts, it makes the highest aim of life to consist in the complete surrender of all individuality. Reason, conscience, and the will are to be, one by one, abandoned as the soul passes into the communion of the Infinite. Sometimes this spirit formulates itself in terms very similar to the Christian ones. Especially, the later schools of Hindu thought insist with great per-

tinacity upon the importance of *faith* as the sole religious duty. But the identity is one of terms only, not of meaning; for one great element of Christian faith is almost entirely suppressed in the Oriental conception. There is no presentation of a personal ideal which is to command the love and the imitation of the worshipper. Faith is directed only towards an abstract being, or else towards those divine incarnations of the Hindu mythology which, under a faint disguise of the human form, are equally abstract, impersonal, and illusory. Hence no moral enthusiasm is engendered, and the faith ends only in dreamy meditations or barren ecstasies. The religious impulse exhausts itself in the endeavor to crush out the human individuality, instead of seeking to ennoble and perfect it. Orientalism, with no moral enthusiasm, can accomplish no reform or regeneration of human life.

No one, however, will confound these conclusions with the familiar theory, that Christianity consists in a happy combination of Oriental and Hellenic doctrines. Of that theory, we have only this to say: First, this combination cannot be proven as a matter of fact. And, secondly, it is absurd to suppose that a mere combination of doctrines, however ingenious, could exert so vast an influence over the practical life of mankind as Christianity has done; more especially as such eclecticism has always proved entirely barren, even in the domain of speculative thought. Christianity, then, unlike Neo-Platonism, is not a mere eclecticism,—an ingenious patchwork of doctrines gathered from the East and the West. It is the fusion of the two great forces of human life into one spirit. Christian faith, when perfectly developed, welds together the moral enthusiasm which the Greek religion engendered and the sense of spiritual need which the Hindu felt.

Before completing this analysis, we must briefly consider the doctrines of Christianity. For, although doctrine is only the product of the moral life, yet in various ways it reacts with great force upon that moral life. It is then a prime condition of a universal religion, that, while furnishing a universal basis of belief, it should not present any doctrine

which might tend to check or repress the future development of the moral sense of mankind. With this condition, pure Christianity invariably complies. Its doctrines, as delivered by its founder, are opposed to no moral impulse, and are never exaggerated into any injurious extremes. They are the simplest and purest expressions of certain convictions which have never been utterly wanting to the human heart, although they have been universally obscured by the influence of speculative extravagance or of moral aberration.

Thus, the theology of Christ has for its basis the doctrine of the divine paternity. And the slightest examination will convince us, that this conception is the simplest and purest expression of the universal belief in God, relieved from all those exaggerations into which the different forms of paganism had run. The Greek, for instance, through his enthusiastic belief in a personal divinity holding personal relations with human life, had been led into the extravagances of Hellenic polytheism. In order to retain the idea of a personal Will superintending the affairs of earth, he abandoned the conception of the Infinite. Zeus, the father of gods and men, is yet a being of human passions and limitations. On the other hand, the Hindu faith in the Infinite was exaggerated into a denial of the personality of God. The universal soul of Hindu theology is infinite Being in its most abstract form, — devoid of will and of all personal qualities, and entirely removed from any sympathy with human interests. Both of these fatal exaggerations the Christian doctrine of the divine paternity avoids. It is the universal belief in God, freed from every thing of a local or special origin; it is the doctrine of a universal religion, — a conception equally fitted to evoke the reverence of the child and the man, equally adapted to the needs of the East and the West.

The same character belongs to the moral doctrines of Christianity. The morality of the gospel is equally freed from the extravagances of the ascetic ideal of the East and of the heroic ideal of the West. It has no taint of national or of individual peculiarities; it lifts no one virtue into prominence at the expense of the others; it elevates no temporary

precept, useful only for a particular age, into the rank of an eternal principle; in a word, it is exempt from all those exaggerations toward which humanity has tended at different periods, and which have crippled the moral codes of all other religions. So in its doctrine of the future life, Christianity is equally freed from the gloomy forebodings of Hellenic materialism and from the wild superstitions of Oriental faith. It is encumbered by none of those fanciful inventions concerning the unknown world, which have been in vogue in almost every age, even of Christian history. It simply places in the clearest light that assurance of immortality which has been felt by all men, and which not even the worst extremes of materialism and worldliness can utterly destroy.

The Christian doctrines, then, are the simplest and purest expressions of the universal convictions of mankind. And, evidently, the *distinctive* influence of these doctrines is only of a negative character. They express the universal conviction, but in a way that does not interfere with any possible development of human thought, as did the one-sided and exaggerated formulas of paganism. But the element in Christianity which is at once positive and distinctive, is faith in Christ. The love of the personal ideal, and the sense of spiritual need, are blended in this central principle of Christian faith.

Again, the development of Christianity, as a moral force in human affairs, proceeds by *antagonism to the dominance and excess of either tendency of human nature*. It seeks to reform the individual or the nation, which has developed one side to injurious extremes, by calling into play the opposite. Paganism gave full play to the controlling tendency of the national life; Christianity opposes it. The theology, the morality, and the ritual of Brahminism were logically evolved from the radical characteristics of Hindu life; and so with the religions of Greece, of Rome, and of all other ancient nations. These religions, therefore, are in the strictest harmony with the nature of the worshippers. They offer no opposition to the popular spirit, from which they really emanate, and, instead of checking the disastrous tendencies of the national

life, are themselves swept on the same fatal flood to the inevitable end. But Christianity, on the contrary, arrays itself in constant and direct antagonism to the nature of the worshipper. So far from being a creation of the popular tendencies, it stands in continual conflict with them. It seeks to communicate a counter-impulse, to implant a new spirit, and thus to radically change the life of the people.

How the two forces of Christian faith co-operate to produce these results may easily be understood. On one part is the sense of need, teaching men to be dissatisfied with themselves, to recognize their corrupt estate, to seek for deliverance. But this alone would effect nothing; it would exhaust itself in the barren, dead reveries of mere pietism. But now the other factor — the moral enthusiasm — comes and moulds the sense of need into a living energy, turning men from self-abasing reveries to an eager pursuit of the lacking virtues, from mystical hopes of deliverance to an earnest striving after a change of spirit. And so the counter-impulse gets under way, moving in direct opposition to the old tendency. There begins that antagonism between the nature and the religion of which we have spoken; the original impulse of the nature tending in one direction, and the moral enthusiasm, directed by the sense of need, tending in the other.

The chief phenomena of modern civilization, we believe, are only to be accounted for through this law of antagonism which we have just presented. Passing by all prior periods, we will begin with the final establishment of the Catholic *régime* in Europe. Concerning the nature of the popular life upon which Catholicism was called to act, there can be but little doubt. Ancient civilization had been destroyed by the invasion, and the wild, vigorous life of the barbarians had taken the place of the effete society of the empire. But, after all, there had been no radical change in the popular nature. The spirit of the Northern nations was essentially that of classical antiquity; only it had not been developed so completely. It was as if the rude heroic times of Homer had been restored. The proud, free, subjective impulse which had created classical civilization was as potent as it ever had been.

And to this Occidental nature Catholicism opposes a truly Oriental form of religion. The Catholic faith is everywhere characterized by the spirit of the East. It magnifies the sense of need and of human weakness, while it constantly obscures the other side of Christian faith by a doctrine of incarnation very similar to the Hindu one. In the place of the supremacy of conscience, it asserts the infallibility of a divine authority residing somewhere in the Church. Against the sentiment of freedom it opposed the doctrine of obedience. Its cardinal virtues were humility, resignation, and submissiveness; its ideal was the saint, self-distrustful, downcast, and sorrowful. Subordinating reason to faith, demanding the entire surrender of the right of private judgment, it reproduced the intellectual life of India in mediæval Christendom. Like Hinduism, it taught men to value truth only as a means of salvation; and thus, as the lack of veracity to-day constitutes the besetting sin of Hindu character, so absolute indifference to truth became the normal condition of mediæval intellect. Catholicism also adopts the ascetic spirit of the East: it nourishes a profound contempt for earthly life, and passionate longings for deliverance; it demands the sacrifice of human nature, the replacement of all earthly affections by the devotions and ecstasies of the saint. Last of all, the Catholic conception of the unknown world was especially of an Oriental cast, its superstitions concerning hell and heaven rivalling the wildest inventions of Eastern mythology. In the Middle Age, as in India, the universal engrossment with the affairs of the future life rose almost to frenzy. It was the sole inspiration of the poet and the artist; it fascinated all hearts with its strange enchantment; it threatened to paralyze the energies of Christendom, and to turn all European life into one long dream of the unknown eternity.

How closely the ecclesiastical polity of Catholicism was allied with that of Oriental religion cannot here be shown. Enough already has been said to exhibit that direct and sweeping antagonism which was established between the popular nature and religion at the beginning of the Middle Age. On one side, as we have seen, were the rude and war-

like populations of Europe, possessed of a nature proud, self-reliant, and restless, enclosing within itself the germ of all those fatal influences which had overwhelmed the civilization of classical antiquity. On the other side, was a religion proclaiming as its cardinal principles the lowliness of human nature, the misery of life, the supremacy of faith over reason, the obligation of obedience; in a word, striving to implant the spirit of the East in the heart of the West.

Many of the more general results of the Catholic system are already well understood. The order which it introduced into the chaotic society of Europe, the sublime faith which it instilled into the souls of men, the lessons of self-sacrifice and charity by which it swept away that cruel and relentless barbarism, that was only somewhat more polished at Rome than in the wilds of Germany,—all these are familiar facts to the student of history. But the law of antagonism goes farther than this. It shows how the entire intellectual development and social organization of the Middle Ages sprang from the operation of these two forces,—nature and religion,—constantly interacting upon each other. It explains the origin of mediæval art, literature, and especially of that poetic sentiment of love for Nature which was wholly unknown to classical life, but has wrought such wonderful results in modern times. It explains the origin of the philosophic movement among the schoolmen, and its influence upon the subsequent history of human thought. Most important of all, it explains the origin of feudalism, that unique social system and great enigma of the Middle Age.

But, finally, the mission of Catholicism came to an end. Little by little, and age after age, the religion had been overpowering the nature, and was at last completely triumphant. Catholicism, so to speak, had thoroughly orientalized all Europe. It had enabled a blind unthinking faith to gain a complete mastery over the life and thought of men; it had fostered the spirit of caste or of veneration for rank; it had nurtured a credulity which faltered before no absurdity or marvel, and a superstition subservient to every priestly demand. In social life, it had triumphantly established the

Asiatic principle of despotism by divine authority, and of the sacrifice of all private rights to the pretended interests of public order; it had thoroughly stifled the old European aspirations for freedom and for truth; it had formed a population among whom ignorance was honorable and servility a virtue; in a word, it was rapidly carrying the people of Europe into the last and most fatal exaggerations of Oriental life.

If, then, the law of antagonism be a true one, it was necessary that Christianity should assume a new phase of development. It must pass around from one pole of human thought to the other. Europe had become thoroughly orientalized, and it was now demanded that Christianity should become animated by the counter-impulse; that it should revive those subjective tendencies of the human spirit which Catholicism had so completely crushed out of the popular life; that it should become the champion of human liberties, the foe of authority, the defender of the rights of conscience and of opinion; in a word, that it should restore the old Hellenic aspirations, and make them once more the supreme ideals of European life. And this new phase of Christianity, which thus arose in accordance with its fundamental law of development, we call Protestantism.

The two cardinal principles upon which the Reformation was avowedly based—the right of private judgment and justification by faith—clearly reveal the character of Protestantism. And even where there has been no avowed or official change from the old system, still the real spirit of the movement is no less apparent. The steady advance of humanitarian views in theology; the increasing tendency in morality to appeal to conscience rather than to the expectation of rewards and punishments; the waning of that love of the supernatural and engrossment with the future, which characterized mediæval Christianity; the abandonment of the old ascetic theory for one which seeks to develop, not to destroy, our human nature; the growing consciousness of human dignity; the decay of sacerdotalism; the growth of the spirit of freedom in all its forms,—these are the most prominent features of the Protestant movement; they are

the evident results of that subjective spirit which, passive for a thousand years, came forth at the Reformation as the active impulse and regenerating power of modern civilization.

Thus, the antagonism between religion and nature was re-established. From this new adjustment of moral forces, we believe it may be shown that the entire intellectual and social development of the last three centuries has proceeded. Especially, it will account for the origin of the industrial movement and the rise of the scientific spirit, — those two great features which so grandly distinguish modern civilization from that of all former periods. But we must content ourselves with mere assertion.

Enough has already been said, perhaps, to give some conception of the theory of historical progress which we have endeavored to present. We have found a radical difference existing between pagan and Christian civilization. The law of the one is development: that of the other is antagonism. Paganism abnormally develops one side of human nature and paralyzes the other. It permits of no reform, but only of the continued evolution of its original impulse into extremes, which grow, age by age, more disastrous to human life. But Christianity is not content to develop the original impulse of the popular spirit; rather, it arrays itself in antagonism to that tendency, and brings into play the counter-impulse of the human spirit. Thus, Christian development is compounded of two energies constantly interacting upon each other, like the chemical and the vital forces in the human body. And this constant interaction of forces is the secret of our modern civilization.

Upon the prospect of the future, which this view unfolds, we cannot dwell. Suffice it to say, that thereby modern progress is for ever preserved from that petrification which has overtaken human development in the East, and from that utter disintegration which wrought the ruin of classical life. Christianity assures the continual advance of mankind towards an ideal civilization that shall give free play to all the forces, and realize all the rightful aspirations of human nature.

ART. II. — THE LAUGHTER CURE.

NEARLY seventy years ago, when Great Britain was suffering from many absurd and cruel laws and customs that have since been reformed, there arose a man with a giant's wit and mirthfulness, which he used with mighty effect against existing wrongs. He showed up the foolishness of much that was worshipped as the "wisdom of our ancestors," and tore off the mask from many corrupt and oppressive institutions. There were then no free public schools, and the private schools were very badly managed. One school-boy, who was afterwards a lord, was forced to toast bread in his fingers for the breakfast of another boy, and during his whole life bore the scars of the burns inflicted on his hands. This was a sample of the system called "fagging." Girls had no chance whatever for a thorough education; high-schools and seminaries were closed to them; they were supposed to be weak-minded, fit only for parlor playthings or domestic drudges. Honest and capable men were kept out of public offices and forced to pay fines for refusing to commit perjury, — the law requiring, as a "test oath," that public officers should swear they believed in certain religious doctrines, whether they believed or not. Sportsmen were harshly punished for shooting the wild animals that infested the land, although the land, in some cases, might be their own. Man-traps and spring-guns were set around gardens and parks, to wound or kill those who thoughtlessly trespassed. Men on trial for crimes which put them in danger of the gallows, were not allowed lawyers to aid in their defence. Men simply accused of crime, and kept in jail to await trial, were degraded by being driven on the tread-mill. The jails were in an awful condition, both as to their sanitary and moral influence upon prisoners. To "rot in jail" was the literal, fatal lot of many poor creatures, guilty sometimes of no offence but poverty. Lunatics were treated about the same as criminals. The misgovernment of

Ireland was such as to produce constant rebellion there; the dinner-tables of the upper classes being "regularly set with knife, fork, and cocked pistol, salt-cellar and powder-flasks." The horrible slave-trade was tolerated. The British court of chancery pretended to preserve and manage the property of widows and orphans; but it often took so many weary years to get a lawsuit decided that the owners of the property starved while the lawyers consumed it for costs. If any man spoke or printed a severe criticism on the conduct of the British government, he was liable to lose his property, and be shut up in a dungeon. The ruling body in the state was the House of Commons, elected chiefly by land-owners, who were necessarily few in number in a country of such small extent. In some instances, poor ruinous old villages sent members to Parliament, while large, wealthy, and populous cities were denied representation. Taxes were enormous, and fell mainly on the shoulders of those least able to bear the burden, crushing the lower millions down to pauperism. The army, navy, and established church were maintained from these unequally levied taxes, and the places of honor and profit in them were given to a small class of born aristocrats. To sum it all up, Great Britain was then properly called "a heaven for the rich, a purgatory for the wise, and a hell for the poor."

But the right man at last arose to turn the laugh against wrongs and nuisances, and to knock them to pieces with his battery of ridicule. He had a wonderfully mingled wit and wisdom, an unequalled power of making fun, and was so good-natured about it that even his victims laughed at the drollery he showered upon them. His perpetually cheerful disposition and flow of spirits, his warm human sympathies, his curious intermingling of mirthfulness with common sense and sound morality, without malice, cant, or vulgarity, pleased and benefited all within the wide circle of his influence. Error, falsehood, hypocrisy, bigotry, oppression, and organized sin in general, could not stand before his piercing wit, which let daylight through many an ancient iniquity, so that the people saw the nature of the evil obstruction, and swept it out of their path. He made the most commonplace subjects amus-

ing, and nothing could withstand the contagion of his joy-inspiring laugh. He caused the bad rulers in church and state to appear like some hard-hearted stepmother, who compels her boy to wear petticoats until he is a big stout fellow; refuses him playthings, story-books, education, or holidays; makes him scour knives, sift coal, and do other menial work, and whips him until his spirit is almost gone. By such queer pictures were the sympathy, the conscience, and the scorn of the British people excited, and reforms brought about.

The man who applied the Laughter Cure to heal so many crying evils in Great Britain was Sydney Smith. He lived from 1771 to 1845; was of French Huguenot blood on his mother's side, whence came his keenness and vivacity, while from his father were inherited perseverance, industry, and liberality. He was a proof of the proverb, "Blood will tell." Young Sydney was a bright, playful, healthy boy, and was trained by his parents with love and care, among brothers and sisters of various ages, so that his affections were kept warm. The benefit of getting a good start in childhood was seen when he grew up to be a handsome, portly, smiling, frank, genial, high-minded man, — a universal favorite with the lofty and the lowly.

He was sent to school at Winchester. The whole system of educating boys seems to have been then one of abuse, neglect, privation, and vice. Young Sydney felt these evils very keenly, and they gave edge to his satire, in later life, on British institutions of learning. But he made the best use of his opportunities at Winchester, and rose to be "captain" of the school. His brother Courtenay was a pupil there at the same time, and such was the rank of the two youths that the other school-boys "refused to try for the college prizes if the Smiths were allowed to contend for them any more, as they always gained them." Sydney and his brother often spent their leisure hours, not in out-door games, but in arguing disputed questions, much above their years, as earnestly as though life and death hung upon the issue. Once Sydney was found by some eminent man reading Virgil under a tree, while all his school-fellows were at play. The gentle-

man looked at the book, patted the boy's head, gave him a shilling, and said, "Clever boy! clever boy! that is the way to conquer the world." This produced a strong impression on young Sydney's mind. While at school he made above ten thousand Latin verses, which he properly regarded as a great waste of time. He spent about six months at a boarding-school in France, and gained a thorough knowledge of the language of that country.

His high rank at Winchester school entitled him to a scholarship, and afterwards to a fellowship, at Oxford University. This fellowship was worth about five hundred dollars a year, and supported him comfortably until he graduated. He received no aid from his father, and even paid certain college debts of his brother Courtenay.

Young Smith would have preferred to become a lawyer, but, by his father's earnest wish, he entered the Established Church. He was at first curate of a small village in Salisbury Plain, — a dreary, lonesome place, — but soon left it to act as tutor for a rich man's son in an adjoining parish. They went to Edinburgh together for the advantages of its university. Here Sydney — now the Reverend Sydney Smith — studied medicine carefully, and gained some knowledge of law. All his life long he read the best books, and sought the society of the best people, and acted on the maxim that "We are never too old to learn." He studied up any subject of which he found himself ignorant, saying that "It is shameful to be a noodle with knowledge at your elbow." His talents were so many and various that he could mix a delicious salad, prescribe for a sick child, plan a comfortable house, write a brilliant essay, or preach an eloquent sermon. And yet his school education was so poor, under the slipshod system then in vogue, that (as he once said himself) he "could not repeat the multiplication table, nor write a handwriting that anybody could read," although he was crammed with Latin and Greek.

The most prominent and useful work done by Sydney Smith was to assist in founding and conducting the "Edinburgh Review," a periodical which still lives and flourishes, in its sixty-seventh year. It is issued once in three months, each number

containing about five hundred pages. It rapidly gained circulation from the start, and has been a source of great profit to its publishers. Through its pages, for about twenty-five years, Sydney Smith administered powerful doses of the *Laughter Cure* to sick and languishing Britain. The medicine worked slowly but safely in the body politic, and a process of purification and reform began which relieved the patient, who has grown healthier from that day to this. All educated Britain read the "Edinburgh Review," and the public ideas were changed by its strong reasoning, pointed with sharp, glittering wit, and fallacy and prejudice were cut up by the roots. Shams and superstitions crumbled away before its honest, ringing mirth. There was no escaping its keen jokes. Monstrous evils, which had defied sober logic and stern justice, were laughed out of existence. Yet Smith, Jeffrey, Brougham, and other writers, to whom the "Review" brought fame, money, and office, were so poor in 1802 that they had to get trusted for the printing of the first number. Smith proposed this motto for the "Review:" "*Tenui musam meditamus avena*" ("We cultivate literature upon a little oatmeal"). But it was too true to be so openly confessed.

During a period of forty-five years, Sydney Smith held various posts in the Established Church, from vicar of a small parish in Yorkshire, to canon of St. Paul's cathedral; and he maintained the character of a kind, hospitable, sympathizing, upright, genial pastor and preacher, with sunshine ever in his heart and brain. He regarded it as the highest duty of a clergyman to calm religious hatreds, and spread religious peace and toleration. He did well the common daily duties of life, to the humble and noble alike, and they all felt at ease before him. He had a truly strong and sound mind, embracing equally great things and small, and a gush of good humor and sparkling wit that roused and refreshed everybody. At Foston-le-Clay, his Yorkshire parish, he was not only the village parson, but the doctor, lawyer, magistrate, architect, practical farmer, general comforter, and faithful nurse to his flock when a malignant fever raged. He had such medical knowledge and skill that his family seldom called in any other,

and he was often urged to be a practising physician. A large manuscript book of his prescriptions is preserved. His fun-loving nature shone out even here, for he called one of his tonic medicines, "Gentle-jog;" a capital embrocation, "Rub-a-dub;" and an emetic by the expressive phrase, "Up-with-it-then." He invented, for the relief of stiff necks and swelled faces, a nicely-fitting case of tin, filled with hot water, and covered with flannel, which he applied to the afflicted part. A similar apparatus he called his "patent rheumatic armor," and it alleviated, in many a poor sufferer, the tortures of rheumatism. He sympathized heartily with little children, servants, paupers, the ignorant classes, the oppressed Irish, the abused chimney-sweeps, the erring and forsaken, even the poacher and vagrant. He once spent a week's time in hunting up evidence to clear of a charge of petty crime, a poor boy whom everybody else believed to be guilty. He recognized the "Universal brotherhood of mankind," when that doctrine was scarcely heard of in religion or politics. A casual hearer of one of his sermons wrote him a letter of thankfulness, stating that his kindly warnings had saved the writer from a life of dissipation and guilt. He delivered a course of Lectures in London on Moral Philosophy, to earn the means of furnishing his house; and his vigorous reasoning, brilliant wit, extensive learning, and impressive manner drew crowded audiences of the most cultivated people. At the lower end of the social scale he was equally popular, and liked to draw out peasants and laborers, and learn from their hard experiences a lesson of contentment with his own lot. He was excessively fond of children,—invented plays, and told fairy tales for their amusement; and once made a good boy as happy as a prince by sticking a red wafer on his forehead as a badge of honor. He was often seen watching by the side of his slumbering babe, with a rattle in his hand, ready to wake the young spirit into joyousness the moment its sleep broke.

Even the domestic animals he contrived to make happy with his "universal scratcher," a sharp-edged pole, fixed firmly to a high and low post, and adapted to every stature,

from a horse to a lamb. It was like the model gate of N. P. Willis, which was described as "bull-strong, horse-high, and pig-tight." He had a very hungry, lazy, balky horse, which he nicknamed "Calamity," after having been thrown from his back; but instead of cruelly whipping and spurring the animal, he increased his speed with the "patent Tantalus," a small sieve of corn suspended on a semicircular bar of iron, just beyond the horse's nose; the corn rattled, and the steed hurried up, in hopes of overtaking his feed. He cured smoky chimneys, improved the fastening of window-blinds, contrived a frugal method of burning mutton fat in lamps, planned gardens for the poor, and directed farming operations from the door of his house, by means of a spy-glass, to watch his laborers, and a speaking-trumpet, to give them orders. He was original in both words and actions. When he wanted his library windows opened and things put to rights, he told his servant to "Glorify the room." He rejoiced in flowers, sunshine, children at play, grown people laughing, and all the cheerful things in nature or society.

This brave, honest man was poor during a large portion of his life. When he was married at twenty-eight years of age to Miss Pybus, his whole fortune consisted of half a dozen well-worn silver spoons. Yet he was happy in his humble poverty, with little apparent chance before him for preferment,—there being, as he said, about the same prospect of a liberal government as there was of "a thaw in Nova Zembla." He laid down two wise maxims for family contentment: 1st, "Look downward at those below you, as well as upward, in the race of life;" 2d, "Avoid shame, but do not seek for glory,—nothing is so expensive as glory." He never indulged in pleasures which his family did not share. He was an upright, careful man of business, and would not run rashly into debt even for an encyclopædia. To save carriage-hire, he walked, an ever welcome guest, to the dinner-parties of his rich and titled friends. He would not cringe to the worldly great, nor sell his wonderful wit to the side of ancient wickedness. He had the courage to appear as he was, and never to ape anybody in showing off more knowledge or more wealth than he really had.

His creed was, always to do one's best, to look on the bright side, to extend the helping hand to unfortunates, to smile when he could, and frown only when he must, and to trust the goodness of Providence in every thing. This creed he lived up to with rare faithfulness. He refused to take more than lawful interest on loans of money. When a church living of \$3,500 a year fell into his hands, he gave it to the worthy son of the former incumbent, and saved a fine family from poverty. This was one of the last acts of his life. He burned the manuscript of a witty, sarcastic pamphlet, because its publication would pain some good people who had been kind to his father. He was so charming in the home circle that his little daughter once said, she "wondered how any family could prosper without a papa to make all gay by his own mirth;" and when he was absent, the dinner appeared to his wife almost as solemn as a funeral. He laid down the rule that no day should pass without his making somebody happy. He discouraged talk or reading about horrible events; would not allow the cholera to be mentioned in his family, nor murders or robberies to be discussed. His plain common sense and sound Christian morality, mingled with rollicking wit and rich learning, pleased and benefited all within his reach, and even those whom he ridiculed could not help laughing at the supremely funny pictures he drew of them.

There is no end to the apt witticisms and pithy phrases of Sydney Smith. Several books have been made up of them, and his best jokes are familiar as household words, at once true and striking, like the story of Dame Partington trying to mop out the Atlantic Ocean. He called good manners the "shadows of virtue;" a violent, persecuting parson he styled "a holy bully;" the characteristic of modern sermons, he says, is "decent debility;" he feared that a certain measure would "turn the English Church into a collection of consecrated beggars;" Botany Bay, he termed "the land of convicts and kangaroos." Classical learning he thinks is cultivated too closely, for "if you feed a young man only with words, he will remain a narrow and limited being to the end of his existence." He describes the Irish peasantry as "six-foot machines for turning

potatoes into human nature." He thus explains the resistance of Scotland to religious tyranny: "England strove very hard, at one period, to compel the Scotch to pay for a double church; but Sawney took his pen and ink and figured on it, and finding what a sum it amounted to, became furious and drew his sword."

When so well-beloved and popular a man spoke from the pulpit, he was listened to as one having authority. When he delivered literary lectures, or made political speeches, or published Review articles, pamphlets, or letters in the newspapers, he found multitudes to hear or read attentively. They expected him to say new and true things in a witty manner. They were ready to be amused by his ideas, and often embraced them because put with such irresistible fun and force. He had great power to attract attention, scatter prejudice, and diffuse liberal ideas. There is no greenness in his writings; he is always mature, strong, and pointed. He had a passionate love of justice and hatred of cruelty, and believed that governments should bring about reforms, and show themselves to the people in some other attitudes than in taxing, restraining, and punishing. He defended the United States of America against British sneers, and some of his wittiest passages were written in praise of our liberty and progress. For example, he says, "The wise toleration of America keeps all religious sects on a level; secures to them all their just rights; gives to each their separate pews, bells, and steeples; makes them all aldermen in their turns; and quietly extinguishes the fagots which each is preparing for the combustion of the other. Yet this is no proof of indifference on subjects of religion, for the Americans are a very religious people. They are devout without being unjust,—the great problem in religion, and a higher proof of civilization than painted teacups, water-proof leather, or broadcloth at two guineas a yard."

Still, Sydney Smith was human, and therefore faulty. He had a good deal more wit than charity, more destructiveness than constructiveness, more worldliness than spirituality. He had but little poetry in his soul, and looked on the im-

mortal verse of Wordsworth, Byron, and Coleridge as "moonshine." He ridiculed Wesley and the Methodists, Wilberforce and the "patent Christians at Clapham." He was not ashamed to borrow his sermons from the printed works of other divines. He longed to be made a bishop, that he could enjoy "purple, profit, and power." He opposed reforms in the Established Church when they threatened his tithes. He liked to have aristocratic classes in society; opposed penny-postage, because it would set all the servant-girls to writing letters; and opposed elections by ballot, because voters could not be easily controlled under that system. He bitterly censured this country and every man in it, because Pennsylvania was slack in paying the interest on her bonds, and Mississippi refused to pay at all, while almost every other State, and the American Union as a whole, paid their debts promptly. He did not always discriminate, but would sometimes cut and slash without caring whom he hurt or whether his victims deserved it. He was fond of high living and choice wines, and took too little exercise; and for these sins against the laws of health, he suffered with gout in old age. Even then he joked on the low diet ordered by his physician, saying that he wished he "could be allowed the wing of a roasted butterfly." He died calmly, uttering in his last hours a touching and eloquent passage on Immortality, from one of his own sermons.

No clergyman in any age, and perhaps no man of any calling, has done more good, by the Laughter Cure, in shaming bigotry, unmasking hypocrisy, exploding error, upsetting pretension, undermining abuses, and pushing on important and blessed reforms, than Sydney Smith. His merits were so great, and his defects so small, that he should be held in honored remembrance by all lovers of rational freedom and progress, especially by Christians not in the Episcopal fold, whom he did much to emancipate from degrading disabilities and "test-oaths" under the government. And he deserves the thanks of the intellectual world for showing that the most brilliant and piercing wit can be displayed without breaking the rules of orthography and grammar, as is too often done by humorists in this country.

ART. III.—PRACTICAL VALUE OF BELIEF IN A
FUTURE LIFE.

The Resurrection of the Dead, considered in the Light of History, Philosophy, and Divine Revelation. By REV. HIRAM MATTISON, D.D. Philadelphia: Perkepine & Higgins. 12mo, pp. 405.

THE absurdities into which the idea of the plenary inspiration of the Biblical record and the infallibility of the letter of the Scripture will lead a vigorous and logical mind are strikingly exemplified in Dr. Mattison's "Treatise on the Resurrection of the Dead." Here and there he is betrayed into contradictions, as where he says that the resurrection will come "in the end of time," and yet insists that the sun and moon will keep their places, and the earth continue in its rounds, after that great event. How that can be, and *time* be abolished, he does not show. But, from his stand-point, his argument is unanswerable. With this literal word, demonstrating the faith of the early Church, and the faith of the later, if not the earlier, Hebrews, he can maintain against science, experience, and common sense, the resurrection of the physical body. He believes in the existence of the soul and its essential immortality, and has demonstrated that fact in a previous treatise,—that man has a double nature, soul and body, is as much a part of Mattison's philosophy as it is of the philosophy of Descartes or Plato. He adds to this philosophy the resuscitation of the body that has died, and its reunion with the soul, as a clear doctrine of the Bible,—a doctrine held by the Church in all ages, and received by all but a few insignificant heretical sects. If the objections were ten times as numerous and as forcible, he would still maintain what the Scriptures so distinctly assert; but he finds it very easy to answer all the objections that are urged, and to set aside the rival theories.

The "resurrection of the body," as Dr. Mattison understands this, is the resurrection of the body that died, of *the*

flesh, — the bones and muscles and nerves, the limbs and organs, the senses, with their functions, eye and ear and tongue and teeth, as well as heart and brain. At the resurrection, the soul, long disembodied, goes back into its former body, which is identical with the original body in every important respect. The new body, indeed, is relieved of some of the former deformities and excrescences. It has less adipose tissue and less water in it; its superfluous portions are sloughed off; there are no warts or wens upon it, and it is purified by a process more effectual than a Turkish bath. It may not have more than "two-thirds" of the substance of the original body; it will take less room probably than the first body, more especially as it will have fewer physical needs to provide for. Allowing to each body a square yard of space, which seems to Mattison adequate, all the dead and the living together will not occupy in the resurrection a larger area than half of the State of New York.

From the scientific stand-point, of course, such a book as this is nonsense and folly. Such an immortality as this promises is crude, unsatisfactory, and impossible. That it sets forth clearly and ingeniously the average doctrine of the Church, does not make this doctrine any more attractive. If any thing could reconcile us to the idea of annihilation, it would be the thought of an eternal life in these physical bodies, when they are deprived of some of their most important functions, bodies which have organs, yet no use for these organs, — teeth and tongue and taste, stomach and bowels, — yet no need of eating and drinking; which of man and woman, yet with no proper sexual instincts. The convenient plea that an omnipotent God can make it all right, and substitute new uses for these physical organs, will fail to quiet minds that are more curious than pious. Such books as these, in an age like ours, may captivate credulous minds; but they only disgust judicious minds, and alienate them from religion; they suggest very radical questions of utility in this whole discussion of "the last things," and make blank materialism more tolerable. The question of the future life to intelligent minds will never be

answered by any such array of proof texts as Mattison marshals in his pages. If Scripture has nothing better for them than this, they will cease to find in Scripture that spiritual life which gives them something better than the world has to give.

And the practical question of the use of the doctrine of the future life comes in more and more to forestall all discussion about its various theories. There are those who hold that the theological doctrine of a future life is nearly, and ought to be wholly, speculative; that it has very little influence, and ought to have no influence, upon human acts or character. It is pressed, they say, by the false alarm of the Church rather than by sound reason or real necessity. In point of fact, they plead, the immense majority of men take no heed of the future life in what they do in the present life, and act without any reference to future fate. Even the great majority of professed Christians have no more than a verbal or an occasional concern for the future state, and are quite as ready as those outside the Church, in their care for the life which now is, "to jump the life to come." In time of dangerous sickness, indeed, there are not a few who turn to consider what is to become of them after they die; and old age, in its hours of reflection, is often drawn to view this near prospect. But, except that the appeals and warnings of the Church keep it so constantly in the foreground, except that the solemn and steady interruptions of actual death compel to the inquiry about human destiny, very few men in health and in business would trouble themselves about the future, or make any special provision for it. Very few men, these observers tell us, consciously and directly lay up any store for the life to come.

And there are those who go still further, and argue not only that this indifference is to be accepted as a fact, but that it is just and right; that the possibility of a future life ought to have no influence upon the works of the present life. They contend, in the first place, that our ignorance of the methods and conditions of this life to come is such as to make it no motive for intelligent action here. We do not

know when this life is, where it is, or what it is,—do not know any thing about it, except that it is a doctrine of the Church. We have no trustworthy information concerning any of its relations, except that they are *not* those of the present life. We know that men there do *not* eat, do *not* drink, do *not* marry, do not plough fields, do not build ships, do not make money, in that life; but what they really do there is unknown to us, except through the crude notions of pious fancy, that, if good, they sing psalms and wear white robes and wait for ever in a kind of ecstasy; or, if wicked, keep burning for ever in a lake of fire. In this ignorance of the whole arrangements of the future life it is impossible that this should be a satisfactory motive for present action. We can only make provision in our action for that which has some chart of its conformation and its need. Raleigh and the rest, in their search for El Dorado, had an imagination at least of the shape and the features of that land. But of the future life no intelligent man, they tell us, can have any such imagination as shall modify his immediate work, his pursuit of any earthly end, or his enjoyment of any earthly good.

Nor is this all. They would have us believe that it is unmanly to go beyond the actual moral character of any action, or to consider at all its future and personal consequences. The hope of reward or the fear of punishment ought not to move those who believe in God and in his truth, and know that justice is as sovereign now as it ever will be. It behooves every true child of God to act only as he knows what the present will of God is, what present justice requires. The moral law under which men live would be just the same were death the end of life; and the duty of man could not be different were it limited to threescore or fourscore years, instead of extending over eternity. It is a low view which brings in the world to come to dictate to the world which is, or to stigmatize this as an inferior state. We know of the present life that we have it, that God has given it, that his rule is over it, that his truth is made known for it, and that every work which is clearly laid out for man may here be done. Why should we, then, inquire any further? Why

should we vitiate the purity of our virtue by this infusion of unnecessary motives? Is not virtue more real when it is absolute, and the result of simple love of doing right? Is not obedience better when it is spontaneous? Is not a righteous man more righteous when he has discarded from his action any thought of what his righteousness may hereafter bring, but is righteous only because he knows that this is the will of God? When one sees that there is good work to do here, and that God calls him to do it, is it fit to add to this call any lust of gold or any fear of pestilence?

Unsound as this reasoning is, it is not without plausibility. It is sound, as the check and the protest against that notion which in the last years has been somewhat quaintly and fitly called "other-worldliness." Other-worldliness may not be in moral quality quite so low as worldliness; but practically it is no better,—perhaps not so good: since worldliness, bad as it is, certainly helps to develop material resources, and improve this lower earth; while "other-worldliness," standing alone, helps to improve and develop nothing. The view of these objectors is good as a protest against the doctrine, that the future world is more important than the present world while men live in the present; or that, in order to exalt the future, the present must be despised. It is good as a protest against the false doctrine, that the main object of life is "to prepare for death," rather than to serve God and accomplish his purposes,—as a protest against the opinion which makes individual future salvation the one great and absorbing end of every man. It is well that we can see that this ought not to be, and that it is not, the great end of life,—that men really spend more time in laying up money for their children than they do in adjusting their own future. Contemptuously as we sometimes speak of this, we ought to remember that it has in it the virtue of disinterestedness; that a man who is getting goods for his children may be, after all, less selfish than he who is thinking of nothing but his own future bliss.

To meet this statement concerning the needlessness of the doctrine of a future life, let us consider some of its uses. We may not, in a short essay, consider them all, or present any

of them thoroughly. Let us see if there are not certain things, indispensable to the comfort and joy of a rational being, which only this doctrine of a future life can provide; if the life which now is does not really require this doctrine to become a satisfactory life. And the first thing to be mentioned is, that *only the conviction of a future life can dignify and spiritualize the present life.* The present life, in its immediate aspect, is a life of sense. Its phenomena bind it to the movements and life of the inferior creation. Man is here an animal, and his wants are animal wants; yet he is not content with a merely animal life, nor will he consent to serve as one of the mere instinctive laborers on this field of earth. He will not allow that he is the brother of the ox and fowl and creeping thing, of the tree and flower and water and rock, while he owns all these; he cannot be reduced to that level, or enslaved to that mechanical bondage. Yet, if he rests in this life, he cannot get beyond it. Spirit never comes out of mere sense. We want the thought of disembodied life to make us see that there is a spirit in these bodies; it is spirit out of them that tells of spirit in them. Before we come really to believe that we have souls in these tabernacles of flesh, we must feel that when these tabernacles decay the soul shall remain. The future alone tells the present what it is, and what it is worth. When we think that after death we shall still continue to live, that, after worms destroy this body, we shall have being to feel and to perceive and to rejoice, then we know that here in this body, here in this life, we are better than the plodding clods, better than the perishing atoms; that in our clay there is an inspiration, and that our earthly life has a nobility which does not come from earth,—that invisible world really brings out the best life of the world which is seen. As the air, invisible and subtle, gives elasticity and vigor to the body which it enfolds, so the world of the soul gives soul to this world of sense which it contains. Without the thought of the future life, there would really be no soul in the present life. And is not this the resulting feeling from all those arguments which would set aside the future as of no importance, that they materialize

the present; take away its elasticity; carry it back to a confinement of mere working forces, away from God's fresh air, into some stifling laboratory, or some damp mine? Without the future, this life of ours is confined and cribbed, and measured by the narrow boundaries which the senses mark and limit. Confined then to earth, it becomes petty and oppressive, and its fourscore years are not worth counting upon. We have nothing to do then but to intoxicate ourselves with brute delights, and forget all spiritual instincts. The formula of life, with this restriction, will be, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

A second practical use of the doctrine of a future life is, *that it directs progress and shows us where to go.* Progress is nothing, unless we know its direction. The natural question to ask of any one who boasts of this is, "progress to what?" Now there is no such thing as individual progress, if we confine our view only to this present life. There may be progress of *the race*; but no thoughtful man is ever satisfied to know that all the progress in which he has any share is the progress "of the race." Men are not contented to see in themselves the drops and dust which fall from the wheels of the life chariot, as it goes on in its journey through time. Progress must be individual as well as general. The future life alone can show the way of this individual progress. Limited to earth, a man is born, grows, matures, decays, and dies, goes up and goes down, and ends where he began. It is only going over a hill, or going round in a circle. There is a childhood, a manhood, and then a childhood again, and all the growth is annihilated, even if premature death do not cut it short. Intellectual and moral progress, in mere earthly relations, share the fate of physical progress. The mind grows, we say, until it can master great problems and take in the round of almost infinite knowledge. Yet see how, one by one, these mental acquisitions slip away, these mental powers fail, until the tottering step and the dim eye become exact signs of the mind which decays with them. Earthly life, by itself considered, sets a fatal bound to all progress; and no wise man cares to go on, when he knows that "going on" is but another name for "going down."

But when the future comes in, then the longing for progress finds its direction. We see an unlimited horizon; we look forward ever, not downward. All that we gain here becomes only the foundation for future gain. The earthly descents are part of the heavenly ascent. Though we may go down into the deep valleys, it is all on the way to the City of our God, and that is on the top of the mountains. Vague as this thought may be, it still gives more direction to progress than the clearest effort of mere earthly search. Crusoe, on his island, may have every thing clear before his eye, so that he can see his way, yet he has far less direction than Israel on the boundless desert. The one can go down only to the near margin of the waters, while the other goes on and on, after forty years of wandering it may be, to the promised land. Progress is directed rather by the line that stretches out indefinitely than by the circle which surrounds even the longest life. It makes no difference whether it be eight or eighty years; but it makes much difference whether it be eighty years or the year of God that knows no ending. The most undefined future gives the soul a surer range than the most determined present. A man may say that he knows better *what to do* if he confines his view to the present life, — knows better how much and what he has to accomplish; but he cannot say that he knows better *how to grow*. His tread-mill may be better jointed, and may go on more steadily, but as the Ecclesiast says of the wind, it only “whirleth about continually, and returneth according to its circuits.”

We pass from this to say, in the third place, that *the doctrine of a future life alone can meet and help the imperfection of the human mind and of human inquiry*. It is a fact which none can deny, that questions innumerable arise in the human mind to which here in the flesh it can give no answer. These questions come unbidden, and they cannot be rebuked or prevented. They grow out of the very constitution of mind; they are as inevitable as fate; they haunt and perplex and overwhelm the soul with their subtilties, and their invitations and their mockeries; they must be met, they must be considered: and yet the more we consider them, the farther off

we are from finding their reason. The human soul is continually urged to seek knowledge where it can gain no knowledge, and to try where it can find no result. If any thing is certain in the history of thought, it is that the longest earthly life cannot begin to meet and supply that want of the mind which it must witness and beget. The soul here constantly sees avenues opened, but cannot tell where they lead; is constantly perplexed and bewildered; and if this life were all, it would end in utter confusion. There are indeed materialists, like Humboldt, who seem to become expert in many earthly sciences, and die satisfied with what they have learned; but most of us cannot imagine the state of mind which will be content to leave so much more than was suggested, as if it were beyond human power ever to comprehend. What are all the acquisitions of the most eminent man of science, all the things which he has succeeded in learning, compared with the things which he has tried in vain to know and discover? What is all that he has found compared with that which he has sought to find, but has not found? Now the future life gives room for this completion of knowledge. The things which here we vainly strive to discern, there shall be revealed to our searching. No problem baffles the intellect when it is sure of time given for its solution; eternity is adequate to any problem, and nothing so high can be suggested to the human mind which it may not at last resolve, if it can only try, for ever. And the future not only assures the mind by giving time, but also by giving new conditions. Here we know that it is flesh and sense which hinder us from understanding many things which we are called to investigate. But the future will emancipate us from flesh and sense, will remove the veil, will take off the husk, and we shall get at the central treasure. No man, remembering that he has an eternal life, and that he shall have a spiritual life, free from these grosser hindrances, need be discouraged or deterred from the most abstruse inquiries, need stifle as vain and fruitless any inquiry which arises, however high, however deep, it may be. Speculations upon Deity and his laws, upon the relation of worlds, upon any thing supermundane, become right

only when the future life is made to promise some issue. Without that, the despairing thinker can only say with Job in his parable, "Whence then cometh wisdom, and where is the place of understanding, seeing that it is hid from the eyes of all living?"

And we may add, as another use of the doctrine of a future life, *that it is necessary to set right the inequalities and apparent injustice of earthly fortunes, and to vindicate moral ideas over apparent wrongs.* If we stop with this earthly condition, we can never be satisfied that the world is under the dominion of a righteous law. Things do not here, to our eyes at least, come out right, — do not come out as our instincts of justice would have them, much less as revelation teaches that they ought to come out. Wickedness seems to triumph over goodness; sin is strong over all the forces which men use against it; corruption, fraud, selfishness, succeed in their plans; cruelty prevails against humanity; passions rule and principles yield. The apparent issues, which for the time are the same as real issues, are not according to the laws of equity. It may indeed be said that this is the result of our short-sightedness, and that God does as truly decree righteous issues here as in any spiritual world, if men would only see them. But there is the difficulty. Men will not see them, and, what is more, cannot see them, until their vision is cleared by faith in the future life. The study of history and the fit comparison of events do indeed prove that there is justice in a great many appointments, where at first we seem to see injustice. But the most of men have no time for this study and comparison; and even to those who have, there will be a large remainder of things unreconciled. Who can believe that the earthly experience of any man, however wise he may be, however calm his thought may be, and however broad his philosophy, can reduce to exact justice all the events which come even under his own notice? He will see many lives in which justice is not done; but bring the future life in, and how instantly this difficulty vanishes. We can expect then another issue; we have room then for assurance that God will verify his word; then we can believe that the

earthly triumph of wickedness is not final, and that God's chastisement shall surely fall on those who transgress his law. This will give the drama its fifth act, and not leave it with the first act, where the plot has only shown its intricacy. If it be some undue pain in our own lives which we lament, we can feel that the future life shall give all the blessing of which that pain has been the preparation. We need not follow the infinite ways in which this thought of the future reconciles the discords of the present, in which the coming day takes from the spectral forms of night their ghastliness, and gives them solemnity. With the future life, there need seem no injustice in the world, no man need to feel that any wrong is really done, and there is space for any hope. But without the future life, we are left to be the sport of contradiction and wrong, and can only exclaim with Jeremy in his sorrow, "He hath enclosed my ways with hewn stone, he hath made my paths crooked."

And shall we not say next, what some perhaps would have said at the first, that only belief in a future life *can assuage grief and reconcile to affliction*? It may not indeed wholly reconcile us to our own death, and it will not do to urge it as necessary in that direction, since there are those who can die calmly without believing that they shall live again, and many who believe that they shall live again do not, from that belief, become willing to die. But in the sorrow which the death of friends brings, in the anguish which comes in parting from those that we love, what else is there that can bring consolation? None but the exceptional few who are either too brutal to feel grief, or who have steeled their souls by a hard Stoic philosophy, can be satisfied to know that their dear ones, in dying, are utterly dead, that the grave, in receiving them, will hold them for ever. Grief will be desperate, when it has only this to rest in. The thought of a future life may not take away all the bitterness of grief, may not bring the mourner to a state of perfect submission and trust; but it will at least take some of the darkness out of his sorrow, will set stars in his night, and remove that utter blackness which would otherwise hang above him. This alone can bring real

light into the thought of bereavement. This offsets the terrible woe of memories and backward-looking thoughts, which only agonize the more one who feels that it is "all over," and that there is no more reality to the life which he can only remember. As the resurrection of Jesus, the life beyond the grave, was the grand fact which made the disciples of Jesus able to speak of his dying, so the future life of those that we love, their life above the grave, makes us able to speak with resignation of the loss which has come to us in their going down to the grave. This is compensation for a part, at least, of our heavy trial. Who can measure the constant force of this belief in the hearts of those who mourn? Perhaps it is transitory, speedily lost in some cases, and, in most cases, after a while. Perhaps time, the great restorer, and the steady cares of life, cure the sorrow which at first seemed beyond relief. But, even here, we may refer to time and work what in the first instance was wrought by faith in the future life. It has been noticed that the sceptic is apt to brood over his grief longer than the believer, and that his hopeless threnody keeps the echo of its strain long after the believer's adieus are softened and spiritualized. Faith in the future life so calms the soul in the beginning, that it is ready for the healing influences of time and work. He who believes that the child torn from his embrace has not been crushed in the jaws of devouring death, but taken as an angel, into the Father's upper house, to wait for him there, to watch for him there, will welcome again that toil which has thus far been turned to the blessing of the lost child. But when there is no home in the sky, no angel world, no thought of the child in heaven, then there can be only the wail of Jacob, refusing to be comforted, — "Joseph is without doubt rent in pieces, and I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning." Once more, we may say that the doctrine of a future life alone *can fill the chasm which separates man and God*. In many ways we perceive this chasm, but in none so evidently as in the fact that we are mortal, while God cannot die. It is the fact of mortality which most distinctly divides man from his Creator. Some of God's attributes are given to him, — in

diminished measure, indeed,—and yet really given. Man's knowledge is a faint reflection of God's omniscience; man's skill is a fragment of God's infinite force; and the conscience of man is really a divine voice in his soul; but dying man is utterly severed from God, except as he has a few years of providential term to fulfil. The thought of our mortality at once brings down and annihilates all that conscience and will and mind had told us of our relation to the Infinite. Far off are we that perish from him that endures unto all generations. The future enduring life at once bridges this chasm, restores the thought of relationship. Living on toward God, we live with him. Our parallel of life, smaller it may be, keeps on with his great equatorial line. This future, of which we see no end, allies us to him of whom we know neither end nor beginning. Man must always be in his own thought less than the Maker, for his eternity looks only one way, while God's eternity looks both ways; his life is a river, which, though lost in the infinite sea, comes out from its narrow cavern, while God's life is only ocean, as grand here as there, with no source and no outlet. Yet when we can see the estuary which receives the river, while it heaves still with ocean tides, we know that there is no separation. The future life of man is that gulf into which the river of his own life flows, while the gulf continually swells with the tide of God's eternity. Without this, man's life, even in its best beauty, is only a lake in the mountains, imitating, in form and color, and the reflection of surrounding objects, the surface of the ocean, but to be swallowed out of sight when the next earthquake comes,—an imitation only, not a part of the ocean. Without the future life, we can only say with Ezekiel, in the chambers of our imagery, "The Lord seeth us not, the Lord hath forsaken the earth." But with the future life, we can realize those words of Jesus, in his prayer for the brethren, "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be with me where I am." The future life alone enables us to realize and share the life of God.

And, with these practical uses of the doctrine, shall we dare to say that it is not practical? We are sent here to live the

life of earth, and to use earth as best we may. But shall we not thank God that the knowledge and assurance of a heavenly life make this earthly life worth living for, guide its way, provide for its feeble thoughts, vindicate its dark providences, assuage its sorrows, and join it to the life of God. Oh that the spiritual world might so touch and embrace the natural world for us, that it should work continually a transfiguration, and should make of us, even in our ministry below, witnesses of a diviner life and companions in a celestial company!

ART. IV. — THE SCHLEIERMACHER CENTENNIAL AND ITS LESSON.*

1. *Friedrich Schleiermacher. Sein Leben und sein Werken.* Für das deutsche Volk dargestellt von RUDOLF BARMANN. Elberfeld, 1868. pp. 160.
2. *Der christliche Glaube.* Nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche. Von Dr. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER. pp. 522–594. Berlin, 1830.
3. *Friedrich Schleiermacher's Grundriss der philosophischen Ethik.* Berlin, 1841. pp. 106 and 299.

IN that realm of wonders that we call the nineteenth century, our own age, we are constantly startled by new lights of science, new triumphs of the arts, the spread of liberty, and the reconstruction of nations upon its basis. We ask, with mingled hope and fear, what is to become of faith and its empire in all these new developments? Is faith to be lost in

* The substance of this article was given in a discourse on the Restoration of Faith, in the Church of the Messiah, New York, by Dr. Osgood, before the united congregations of Unitarians. Dr. Bellows assisted in the service, which was attended by a large assembly, among whom were many noted scholars and lovers of German thought and heart. Our United-States Minister at Berlin, among others, joined in the request for the commemoration. The article owes its unscholastic and popular form to this occasion, and it did not seem best to the author to make any essential change in this respect. The commemoration was held on Sunday evening, Nov. 22, 1868, and was fully noticed in the German press here and in Europe.

the passion for absolute knowledge? or to enlist the new knowledge in widening her horizon, upbuilding her temple, and opening new observatories for her vision into the spiritual world? Some there are, and they neither few nor feeble, nor depraved wholly, who think that the ages of faith are gone, and the age of positive science, with its sharp sight and exact calculation, has come. We propose now to pay our tribute to the man who, in his way perhaps beyond all others, strove to unite the mental freedom of the nineteenth century with positive faith; and the centennial of whose birth we have celebrated with the millions of his German countrymen, who have been led by his genius and piety away from degrading materialism to spiritual ideas, or from a cold, impersonal deism, — a pale shadowy religion of nature, — or a shallow scriptural literalism and a poor prudential ethics, into loving confidence in God and his Christ. In our view, Friedrich Schleiermacher stands at the head of the philosophical restorers of faith in the nineteenth century, as Voltaire stood at the head of its assailants in the eighteenth century.

Let it be our aim in this article to give a familiar and popular, rather than a scholastic and metaphysical, view of the man, his time, and work. We ought all to know him, and the strange fact it is, that, whilst even his name is hardly known to our people, there is not a theologian of any mark in America who has not been much under the influence of his thought, and the tendencies now most active in the advance movements of our American Church are most in the line of his ideas. His is the name that stands for the union of freedom with faith, knowledge with devotion, theism with Christianity, and manly individualism with catholic universality. In his first two memorable works, the "Reden" and "Monologen" (Discourses and Monologues), he seems to stand on the Abarim, from which he can see at once the wilderness of doubt that he is leaving, and the promised land of faith which he is entering; and in the name of God and nature, reason and conscience, he turns his back upon the unbelief of the eighteenth century, and welcomes the new age of faith

and enthusiasm. Who of us does not feel young blood beat anew in his heart, as we read these words from the "Monologen," — in this little book, which is one of the first edition, — the New-Year's present with which he greeted the year 1800?

"What cheers me now shall always cheer me; vigorous shall be my will, and vivid my imagination, and nothing shall rob me of the magic key which opens to me the mysterious doors of the higher world, and never shall the fire of love die out. . . . Even unto the end will I be stronger and more living through every action, and more loving through every idea; youth will I wed to age, that even age may have fulness, and be pervaded by vital warmth. This have I decided upon, and will never give up; and thus, smiling, I see the light fade from the eyes, and gray hairs springing between fair locks. Nothing that can be done may narrow my heart; fresh beats the pulse of the inner life until death."

So wrote the young preacher of the Charity Hospital in Berlin, 1800; and on Feb. 12, 1834, at the age of sixty-three, he died, with the blessing of the cup of communion upon his lips, saying to his family, "In this love and fellowship we are one." Let us see now what are the chief aspects of the momentous public life that filled the interval (1800-1834), after a glance at his years of preparation.

He was born in Breslau, the capital of Silesia, in Prussia, Nov. 21, 1768. His parents were of the German Reformed Church, which is essentially what we call Calvinist, and as such is distinguished from the more ritualistic Lutheran Church. The chief experience of his youth was his life among the Moravian Christians, who at once won his affections and repelled his understanding. He could not believe that Jesus was the Almighty God; nor that God died to expiate sin; nor that he would torment his creatures eternally; and, whilst at the Moravian College at Barby, he joined a little knot of free inquirers, among whom were several Swiss, one English, and one Swedish member. Yet he never ceased to be grateful to the Moravians for their influence upon his religious affections; and, many years after, he wrote that no place had done so much for his spirit, and that, after

all, "I am again a Herrnhüter, only of a higher order." At the age of nineteen, he entered the University of Halle, and passed two years in earnest study without definitely fixing his religious opinions. After three years as tutor in the family of Count Dohna, where he first saw the refinements of society, and greatly helped his culture by the conversation of accomplished women, he took holy orders, and began to preach as assistant to his aged uncle. After two years, he was appointed chaplain at the Charity Hospital in Berlin, where he lived six years, with sufficient distinction as a preacher to have a course of his sermons published, yet more conspicuous as a man of letters than a theologian, and not wholly freed from the lax notions of religion that prevailed in the literary and social circles of Berlin. He could preach at that time according to the current standard of opinion, without having very clear or fixed Christian convictions, and was positively religious without being positively Christian.

He was more a Theist, if not a Pantheist, than a Christian, and perhaps he all the more fulfilled his mission, and did his providential work by advancing from Theism to positive Christianity: like the Greeks of old who would see Jesus at the feast, and who brought their Greek taste, sentiment, and reason into the Christian Church, and made the glorious triumph of Christendom, when classic wisdom accepted the Christian faith, and the scholars of Plato and Zeno made virtually their august confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." His two first works of note were essentially from the Theistic, if not the Pantheistic, standpoint; and were a glowing plea for religion and morality, without urging distinctively Christian principles. His "Reden" — Discourses to educated men among its despisers (1799) — contended most fervently for essential religion as the great want of the human soul, apart from all theories, forms, and doctrines; and has little in its pages that Plato could not accept, and perhaps nothing that Spinoza could not have written. It is the cry of man for his portion in the great universe, — nay, for the universe itself; for the all of nature, man, and God; for the Infinite itself, without bondage to any

finite limitations. Each soul, according to him, must seek the priceless good for itself, and no man can worship for another any more than he can breathe and live for him. Affinity, brotherhood, there can be; but no lordship, no dictation over brethren. Two great religions appear in history, — the Hebrew and the Christian: the Hebrew, which reveals the Infinite as intervening in things finite, and so ruling from above; the Christian religion, which brings the Infinite and finite into union, and reconciles God and man, eternity and time, heaven and earth.

Great was the effect of this electric appeal to the religious heart of Germany, at a time when religion had hardened into a petrified creed, or crumbled into a worldly morality. Here was the soul of philosophy pleading for religion as the only true life, and scorning alike the bigots who would shut her up in their prisons, and the worldlings who would drive her from their schools and *salons*. A Russian count dated his new birth from reading the book; and the famous preacher Claudius Harms declared that it made him a new man, and led him to regard all rationalism and self-culture as nothing, and to believe in a salvation that is not of ourselves. Some of the thoughtful among the Jews were delighted with the book, which seemed to present religion without dogma, and Christianity without Christ; and they asked to enter the Christian Church without belief in Christ: but found no encouragement from the author, even in his large latitudinarianism. Even then he declared that Christ and the Church were one.

Then came the "Monologues," which I have already quoted; which were a plea for the soul's freedom, as the "Discourses" were a plea for faith. Man not only belongs to the universe, but he has a life and will of his own, and he is to put the stamp of his own personality upon the world of nature and history. Two modes of influence there are, — the one, the mode of the artist, whose works are symbols and signs of humanity; the other, the mode of the true man, who makes his life an embodiment of faith and love, and puts their mark upon the world. The man should shape society, and command destiny

instead of obeying it. So this prophet of faith and freedom — uniting Plato and Zeno, Spinoza and Kant, in his mind — stood upon the threshold of the nineteenth century, and made his stirring appeal to the drowsy ear of the old formalism, and to the impotent ear of the new radicalism. His admirable translation of Plato, begun in 1802, in retirement at Stoppe, carried out the same idea; and presented him among the clergy of the age as chief among the Greeks who would see Jesus, yet had not seen his full glory.

Some persons may, and undoubtedly do, prefer to contemplate him at this period of his life, when the philosopher was more prominent than the theologian, and the Theist was more pronounced than the Christian. But we see defects alike in his thought and action that subsequent progress removed. He escaped all suspicion of immorality, yet was not wholly sound in his views of social rectitude during his early career among the rich and luxurious Jews and easy-mannered literati of Berlin. His wish to have Eleonore Grunow, an accomplished woman and childless wife, separate from her husband by divorce, and then marry him, may pass for morals among Theists of a certain sort, but not with earnest Christians, among whom he afterwards took his stand, and wrote his condemnation of such infraction of that marriage covenant, which positive Christianity alone can make and keep. There is no one point of time indeed that marks his spiritual regeneration, and from the beginning of his career he had a tender love for Christ; yet we may mark the publication of his great work on the "Christian Faith" (1821) as the full and public confession of his convictions, and as the most memorable theological work since the "Institutes of Calvin." Not only his own active mind, and the cravings of his own spirit, but his practical training in the affairs of the university, the nation, and the Church, led him to bring his religion to its true centre in Christ, as the great fact of God's grace and man's redemption.

Individuals are the great realities of history, said his associate Hegel, the severe philosopher of the intellect; and whilst Schleiermacher was at Halle, the man who embodied

the positive materialism of the age, and used the forces of revolutionary liberty to run the engine of military despotism, crossed the quiet student's path; and after the victory of Jena, Napoleon entered Halle, full of wrath at the students and professors of the university in particular, and at the world of ideas in general. Busy with his studies of the New Testament, our scholar did not care to go to the window to see the upstart Corsican, who was trying to play the part of Cæsar and Charlemagne, and set up kings and popes at pleasure, or throw them down. Yet the weapons were not wholly with the imperial soldier: the scholar had a magazine of Greek-fire that floods could never quench, and which burned after Napoleon's batteries were silenced and his armies routed. The scholar and preacher turned against the French invader all the forces of intellectual liberty with its allies in the Spirit of God. He wrote and preached and prayed for the fatherland, union, and liberty. Little man as he was, with a hump on his back, and at times a halt in his gait, he took his place at the close of the war among the volunteers, and drilled with rifle and cartridge-box; and afterwards, when the soldiers entered the church, after stacking their arms outside, he preached to them a sermon all on fire with patriotism and liberty, and administered to them the communion in preparation for death on the battle-field. In his New Year's sermon, 1807, whilst he preached from the text, "Fear not them that kill the body," he called the people to lay hold of that divine force that renews body and limbs, puts a mighty heart into every weapon, and makes the man cheerful and brave, ready and invincible, to stand up with the world at defiance, with God for his portion, and his soul at peace. In 1813, when Napoleon fled from Russia, our scholar read from his pulpit the call of the king to the people (*mein Volk*); and on Passion Sunday, March 28, followed it up with a patriotic sermon, an account of which he wrote to his friend Von Raumer with the words: "You know from me that I desire, as the essential condition of a truly Christian, that is, free state, its own nationality free from the chains of foreign dominion." The preachers of America say amen to his

words, and have said it in the war for national life which the slave power made against us, in league with the kings and lords of Europe, headed by the third Napoleon, without any signal exception but the Czar of Russia.

The scholar lived to see Germany free from French rule, and never despaired of seeing her throw off the fetters of the Holy Alliance, which introduced the new bondage of reconstruction. Germany to-day, united as never before, speaks his name with love, and her best blood greets him as a prophet of better times still to come.

He carried this work of patriotism into the Prussian Church, and led the movement to unite the two great sects, the Reformed and Lutheran, which made the third centennial of the Reformation, in 1817, such a jubilee. He presided over the Berlin Synod for reunion, and wrote the call to the whole Prussian Church to unite in one common union at the jubilee of Oct. 31, 1817; yet scrupulously to avoid invading individual liberty, and to be content with fraternal and devout fellowship, without insisting upon dogmatic uniformity. He triumphed, and was also in some respects defeated. The union of churches took place; yet he always contended against the disposition of the court to force a state religion upon the churches, and against the disposition of bigots to insist upon the letter of the old creeds and the minutiae of the old or new ritual. He was the Broad Churchman of his country and age, and strove and prayed to bring all Christians together who had the Christian conscience in its faith in Christ and fellowship of brotherhood. His liberality and moderation did not save him from suspicion and assault. Demagogues attacked him for not favoring their incendiary plots; and morose conservatives doubted him, because he would not compromise his principles of liberty in their interest. But he kept on, apparently without swerving through fear or favor, and gave the last years of his life to sacred studies and instruction. In 1831 the king sent him the star of the order of the Red Eagle; which he received with modest acknowledgment, but never wore. What need had he of the Red Eagle of the court, when his pen and

voice had won for him the order of the White Dove, the Holy Spirit, from the Church of God?

His great work, "The Christian Faith," first published in two volumes, in 1821, crowned the labors of his life, and gives him his place as one of the great fathers of Christian thought; and, in the opinion of not a few, among whom our United-States Minister at Berlin numbers himself, as the founder of modern theology. It is a devout, yet wonderfully bold book; fervently Christian, and as fervently liberal and reasonable. His great characteristic principle is the Christian consciousness or mind; and he builds religion and theology, not upon the priesthood or creeds, upon dogmas or texts, but upon the witness of God, through Christ, in the human soul. The soul is conscious of not being infinite or almighty, and needs to lean upon the Infinite and Eternal One. The soul has a certain sense of dependence that yearns for God, and rejoices in his manifestation of himself. This sense of dependence is known as an instinctive feeling before it expresses itself in ideas; and, like the craving for food, it can taste the flavor of the bread of life before it can analyze its elements. This feeling does not exclude thought, but demands it; as literary taste does not exclude thought, but cherishes it, and seeks the reason of the art or style that so charms the ear or fancy. The soul's sense of dependence must have an object, which is God; and God has never been without witness among men. As nature shows the evolution of physical forces and laws, history, the collective experience of man and record of God's kingdom, shows the evolution of rational and spiritual forces and laws. As God lifts up the mountains, and opens the living springs in nature, so he reveals himself in the events and powers of the moral world, and draws near men in his kingdom of reason. Jesus Christ is the manifestation of God to man, not as a teacher and example merely, but as the living and lasting fountain of life and salvation. He is not a passing shower, nor a limited cistern, but a perennial spring, an unfailing river of divine grace. God in Christ is to be received into the soul in personal faith, and to become the ground of peace, the spring of righteousness, and the

bond of fellowship. Christ is the quickening centre of the Church. From him all comes, to him all returns. All Christians can meet around him in common consciousness, and our divine never assailed any who cherished the Christian's love for the Master. Brave Protestant that he was, and stern critic of Romish usurpation, he never assailed the Catholic's inward religion, and the Roman Catholic clergy of Berlin attended his funeral. He gave the famous statement that so well presents the difference between Protestant and Catholic: "Catholicism makes the relation of the believer to Christ depend on his relation to the Church; Protestantism makes the relation of the believer to the Church depend on his relation to Christ." Thoroughly Protestant, our divine claimed for each soul direct access to God in Christ, and looked upon the Church as founded on Christian souls, without insisting that Christian souls were founded primarily upon the Church. So he was a Protestant of Protestants, and his liberalized Calvinism repeated the stern Genevan's protest against priestcraft, and was not willing to yield his free Christian consciousness into the hands of the Lutheran High Churchmen, who played the old game of Ritualism in the nineteenth century, and are playing it still. So his inborn and inbred Greek intellect appeared in his theology; and he was the Hellenist of his age, as St. Paul was the Hellenist of the apostolic age. His Greek mind sought the realm of universal ideas,—looked to the spirit within, and sometimes above, the letter, and the eternal word within, and sometimes above, the textual words. He must find or make harmony everywhere: and to him God was one being in trinal manifestation; all nature and history must serve his one Providence, and eternity must bring the consummation of his one kingdom, with no hopeless or endless misery to perpetuate discord in the universal all. Yet he was no mere rationalist, and held devoutly to the divine mission and nature of Christ; preached the worth of his sufferings and death in the work of salvation, and in forming the conscious union between God and the soul; and he looked to the glorified Lord in heaven as the centre of the divine kingdom and of

divine communications by the Holy Spirit. The sacred person of Christ was the inspiration of his thought and word; and his sermons, full as they are of close analysis and sharp discrimination, are all full of Christ, and begin and end with his grace. He never indeed lost sight of the human Jesus, but he lived in the riches of the divine Christ. So great was the inspiration, that the pen stood in his way in preaching, and he poured out his own soul and God's truth and grace in a tide of clear, flowing, and inspiriting eloquence. He was thus of the Positivist school in heart as well as mind; and believed that, as in natural science, ideas come from facts, rather than facts from ideas,—it is the same with spiritual forces: they come from the great powers and facts of God's continuous kingdom; and to him the great fact—sunrise in history—was "God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." The great reconciliation was in his view sorely needed; for sin was not merely the fault of the individual, but the perverse mind and habit, the evil consciousness of the race, which needed the grace of a divine Saviour to give new mind to the race as well as the individual, and build up the kingdom of heaven among men. Yet even in his treatment of sin, he shows the Greek rather than the Hebrew temper; and to him sin is more an habitual imperfection of mankind, through the continuous sway of the flesh over the spirit, than an utterly depraved and wilful rebellion against God. It is quite as much, if not more, the imperfection of a perverse child than the depravity of a fiend; and the remedy is sought rather in the loving grace of the Son Beloved of the Father, than in a bloody expiation to the wrath of an angry king. The kingly idea of God he little cherished; and ever sought the Father's face in the Son, hardly willing to take the Hebrew point of view enough to enjoy reading or interpreting the Old Testament, with its characteristic truth of God above nature, its celestial monarch. Yet the grandest of all Hebrew ideas, this great Christian accepted devoutly; for he ascended from all known facts, laws, and powers to the Supreme Cause; and all nature and all life, man and his instincts, Christ and the Church,

came forth from the almighty will, and all the tables of truth came from that Horeb of Eternal Being.

What, then, is the significance of this man for our time, and especially for our country? We reply, that he is to us, under God, one of the chief restorers of faith in this age of presuming materialism and naturalistic scepticism and popular and royal man-worship. The son of the doubting yet aspiring eighteenth century, he brings to us its independence, its observation, its glowing humanity, its vague but burning Theism, to the doors of the Church of Christ, and asks entrance for himself and his thought. He represents thus the new universality of our time in protest against all narrowness of sect and creed and dogma, and in alliance with the instincts of piety. As step by step he ascended the temple hill, and heard the prayers and chants of the sanctuary, he found there place for all his faith and affection; and his God of Nature and the Soul was not withdrawn, but revealed in fulness, in the God and Father in your Lord Jesus Christ. So in him Theism was not narrowed but enlarged into Christianity, and Christ not only widened his vision of God, but intensified the power of his hold upon the Spirit of God, and brought the Eternal Spirit to be his helper. All honor to him for that good office of bringing Theism to Christ, and so repeating the great marvel of primitive history, when Greece distanced Judea in reception of the gospel,—an office that needs to be renewed now in our time and land, when a vague and superficial Theism asks to reverse the process, and put itself in the place of positive Christianity, with the result that might be expected, in wavering faith, waning love, not without fear of desecrated homes and sanctuaries. For affirmative Theism, whether Greek or Roman, empirical or transcendental, we have no anathemas, but blessings, grateful as we are for all religious life; but the greatest blessing for all Theists is to put them in the path of faith, where they may see Jesus, and hear the word, "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him."

The second good work of Schleiermacher is his bringing all Christianity to its central principle of Christ in the Chris-

tian consciousness, instead of looking for the central principle in priesthoods, creeds, records of miracles, texts of doctrine, or precepts of ethics. So he met the great conflict of his time by ascending a height overlooking both parties, and planting himself upon the fact of religious experience, he looked down upon the quarrel between naturalists and supernaturalists, strong in the faith that true experience of Christ is from a source above nature, not destructive of nature or any part of the divine order. To him religious experience or Christian consciousness was a great supernatural fact completing the order of nature; for it came from God in Christ, and was not merely a human development or culture. Free in Christ, he shunned the error of our Free Religionists, who regard all religion as comprised in the idea of love to God and man, by urging the divine grace that enforces the precepts, and finding in Christ and the Spirit the inspiration to obey the divine law. So his Christian consciousness was dynamic as well as ideal, and affirmed the power as well as the wisdom of God unto salvation. It rested on the great spiritual fact of the Word incarnate in Christ, and not upon the miracle of the birth of Jesus, which he freely discussed with a critic's latitude.

We need that view of religion now, and our best teachers are presenting it to the people, — presenting the living gospel, and assured that its powerful vitality will invigorate all the limbs of the Christian system, as the heart and brain invigorate the whole body. Narrative and miracle can live for us now only as they partake of that divine life of the Head, and all attempts to rewrite the life of our Lord are subordinate to his own life of himself, which he is ever writing in the human heart, and of which the Christian consciousness is the unceasing publication. Let Renan romance and sentimentalize, and Strauss prose and speculate about Christ. Our Lord himself is answering them in the power of the Spirit, and all vital Christianity is the newly edited life of our Saviour.

This life of Christ which is thus writing itself in the Christian consciousness, is manifesting itself in every sphere of humanity, and carrying out this consciousness into the world,

to reclaim it to the kingdom of God. Here is another grand virtue of our sage, that, whilst he led all Theism into Christianity, and all Christianity into consciousness, he aimed to lead this Christian consciousness into all spheres of life, and make it tell on the individual and society in all holiness and virtue and duty. With him morality is practical Christianity; faith is the Christian conscience at rest, and true morality is that consciousness in action. All righteousness begins in the supreme good, which is the sum of all rational and natural perfection, which has its great expression in the human and divine life of Jesus. From this supreme good all virtues are derived, just as the forces of nature are derived from the organized life of the universe; and virtues are the forces of the soul, as gravity, electricity, &c., are the forces of organic nature. Duties are virtues put into practice, and correspond with the mechanism of nature, that applies natural forces to their objects. These three — the supreme good, virtues, duties — embrace the whole of ethics, and are to the realm of reason what the organized world and its forces and mechanism are to physics or the science of nature. In each relation of ethics, our philosopher traces the important distinction between what is private or individual, and what is universal, and affirms that every faculty of man and every sphere of life belongs to the whole universe as well as to the private personality, — a distinction which the great master of modern ethics, Rothe, affirms to be as essential to sound moral science as the laws of Kepler are to the principles of astronomy. According to this distinction, the soul repeats the law of the universe, and every thought, like every atom, is not only for itself, but for the All.

Great is the power of this idea of universality when carried out into life, and made the foundation of the grand modern catholicity that combines freedom with love, individuality with comprehensiveness, and calls on each one to live for and in the All. Our sage developed this idea strongly in his various treatises and lectures on ethics; and it is at the foundation of the matchless work of his disciple, Rothe, on "Theological Ethics." But Schleiermacher was able to carry it out

largely into life, and do much to expand the common dogged German individualism into more generous fellowship, and break down the barrier between cliques and castes, schools and creeds, races and churches. So he became the Protestant Catholic of Germany and Europe, and, without pinning his faith to the sleeve of pope or bishop, he went for the fullest charity between man and man, and the freest possible fellowship of church with church. Without being a ritualist or ecclesiast, he strove to harmonize and inspire a comprehensive church life, and do all in his power to make church institutions — preaching, prayer, music, poetry, architecture — help the people to the true Christian consciousness, and open genial communication between religion and life. The Prussian Evangelical Church, in spite of its seclusion and frequent dogmatism, is a monument of his freedom and catholicity, and we have the assurance of the grave and trustworthy Swiss scholar, Hagenbach, that there is no German theologian of any mark who has not been greatly under the influence of his mind and works.

Our America shares in the debt to this man. Moses Stuart applied his profound essay on the "Trinity" to the somewhat Tritheistic orthodoxy of Andover and New England, and did much to remove the offence. George Ripley brought the great German's large philosophy and interior faith to bear upon the over-legal religion and Judaizing Monotheism of the Andrews Norton school of Unitarians, and so enriched the religious life of Unitarianism in that direction. It has seemed that our scholar's Protestant catholicity has been at work in the reconciliation of the Old and New School Presbyterians, and that the mantle of his evangelical charity and wisdom, without his speculative laxity, has fallen upon the leading Presbyterian scholar of America, Henry B. Smith, in his work of peace. We Americans are just now in a position to appreciate his temper and genius, for there is a very wide desire among us to have something of the work of reunion done here that he did in Germany; and that denomination that offers our people the best combination of faith with freedom will win the heart of the nation. Which will it be? we all

ask; and the question will perhaps be answered effectually from some unexpected quarter and under the lead of some unexpected man.

It is remarkable that Methodism originated at the same fountain from which our Christian sage drew his first inspiration; and he, with Wesley, drew his sweetness and pathos, his religion of feeling, from the Siloa of Moravian pietism. How like, yet unlike, in nature and destiny, the two, — the English Methodist and the German Evangelical! Both Wesley and he found religion in the heart, and built the Church upon religious experience or Christian consciousness, and had the same affectionate trust, and not a little of the same methodical mind. But Wesley was more of a soldier of the Cross, and less of a sage, and more too of a fiery Hebrew zealot of the offended law and of the expiatory sacrifice, than a Greek votary of that Eternal Word, whose first scripture is the Kosmos, and whose final scripture shall be the perfected kingdom of the glorified Son, without a note of discord and without a sigh of despair. Wesley is the Methodist of the heroic will, and Schleiermacher the Methodist of the devout reason, and each differs from each as Hebrew England differs from Greek Germany, the land of authority and business from the land of ideas and culture. The two must meet as never before in America, and it may be that the future Church of America may unite these two Methodisms in one.

It seems strange that a thinker so free and a man so genial should belong to the Reformed or Calvinistic Church, that so quarrelled with Luther's churchly heart and jovial humor. With us Calvinism has quite another aspect, and its greatest name in America is Jonathan Edwards, that Puritan schoolman whose presidential chair at Princeton has of lately been so ably filled by a Christian scholar from Scotland. What a contrast, — the German, who, in the height of his fame, was not ashamed to go into a hall of festive students, and with glass in hand give a toast in favor of allowing arms to the people, without fear; and the New England divine, whose children were afraid to sit without leave in his presence, and who drank out of a cup of silver, whilst they drank from tin!

Yet they were both Calvinists, and both severe reasoners, and not without gentle emotion and beautiful taste. The American, however, reasoned on the Hebrew base of the literal Scriptures, and brought the weapons of the new metaphysics into the service of the old theocratic religion, without taking his stand upon the free soul in open communion with God and his Christ; the German too little appreciated the Hebrew Scriptures, probably insisted too little upon the Christian idea of the transcendence of the Father, and began with the Eternal Word, and the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, and rejoiced in the Christ as the Greek rejoiced in the sunshine that fell in beauty and sweetness on mountain and valley, temple and tomb, shining from above upon nature; but bringing out her lineaments instead of mar-
ring them, and interpreting instead of annulling her laws. This Hebrew and this Greek are coming together in America, and our reformed Calvinism is most generous in its new aspects, and sometimes hails the new movement of Christian mind, that looks upon the Incarnation as the completion, not merely the repair, of creation, and places Christianity upon the throne of the Kosmos, and not merely in its hospital or penitentiary.

We who are of the evangelical order of Unitarians, and who, with the German, build faith and the Church on Christ, in free consciousness, owe much to this German, and he has been a strong leaven in our lump. He has much affinity with our cherished father Channing, who had all of his passion for liberty, his love of large culture, his impatience of formalism and priestcraft, and his large catholicity. Channing had a more exalted personality, more majesty of character, more constant dignity of thought and life; yet was less of a scholar and thinker, a more recluse patriot and limited theologian. No man ever laid familiar hand on Channing's shoulder, or asked him to drink beer with jovial students; and his young days of fancy record no trace of his trifling in society, or even innocently sentimentalizing with women, yet he leaves less mark of his thought than of his character upon the world, and his place is that of a stirring prophet

more than of an illuminated sage and apostolic father of the Church. He was the better writer, but less profound thinker; and, whilst he combined his thoughts and imaginations in more telling sentences and illustrations, his analysis was inferior to the German's, and he has left no philosophy of his own, but a mighty moral influence. He differed from the German not so much in faith as in method: both believed in the Christ of God; but the American looked with truth upon Christ as man rising into communion with God, whilst the German, with equal truth, saw in Christ God descending into union with men. These two men are mighty in their way, and are coming together. They were both little in stature, and therefore like the little leaven that leavens the whole lump.

We do not call either man our master, whilst we rejoice in their contributions to the religion and theology of our time. They belong to the great company of noble souls who are restoring faith, with liberty of reason and conscience; and accepting Christ as the light, and not the eclipse, of humanity. Coleridge did something of this work in England; and his spirit, with Arnold's, is still powerful there in saving science from materialism, and putting the Church upon a broader foundation than the priestly prerogative or the magical ceremonial. The German had some excuse for his greater latitude, in the fact that he had no such domestic and national order of religion to build upon; and he was born a Calvinist, not a Churchman.

Our American Broad-churchmen are doing much of his work; and Bushnell does not greatly differ from Schleiermacher in his essential ideas of God, Christ, human needs, and salvation. He, however, comes to the subject in a different way; and, with Bushnell, the new thought is a reaction against narrow orthodoxy, not against the vulgar old rationalism of the eighteenth century. Channing follows in the same path, and protests against rigid orthodoxy in his first works, whilst at the close of his life he was equally strong against the new naturalism. Theodore Parker deserves to be named in the great movement, for his protest against basing religion

upon texts and miracles alone, and for his powerful affirmation of the Christian consciousness; but he greatly wanted historical catholicity, and he urged the great truth of the immanence of God, with too little sense of its evolution in the ages, and its connection with Christ and his Church. His irascible temper made his negations more emphatic than his faith; and probably a future age may give him credit for a positive affirmation of Christianity, which some of his obtrusive followers seem to think derogatory to his reputation.

So now, in this article, we recognize the centennial of the birth of the evangelical sage of Germany, and the voices of a hundred years sound in our ears with the music of these organ notes at our church service. 1768 - 1868, — what a century, that began before Napoleon was born or America was a nation, or science had begun its wonders of mechanical and chemical art, and that now closes upon the Europe of Frederick William and Napoleon and Victoria and the America of to-day! What shall we say of it, and of the intellectual freedom that has made it what it is, and called man into free and rational relations with nature, society, and God? What shall we say of the Greek mind that would taste and see and prove all things, and hold fast that which is good? or, if you please, with the Protestant mind, that rejects dictatorship, and claims the right of man's soul to find its rightful object, and bring the facts of the universe and history directly to mind? Is it a failure or not, — a failure that we have sought truth in its own eternal springs, and not in any decaying cisterns? Let history answer, and show the triumphs of faith in every sphere of free seeking, — whether the naturalist's faith in the truth of nature, the philosopher's faith in the human mind, or the devotee's faith in the living God and his kingdom in Christ and the Spirit. What a chapter of the history of that century is the record of the movement of the Christian consciousness, and how Methodist zeal and Evangelical wisdom and charity lift up their prayers and hymns in thanksgiving and jubilee over the triumph of faith and freedom! Mistakes, shortcomings, lack of thorough organization, there have been also; vices and sins, license and misrule, too

much and too many : but no failure. Who of us will say that the freedom of that century is a failure ? or look to the shaven head of Father Ignatius or the monkish tracts of Dr. Pusey, to rid us of the frightful mistake of using our own hearts and minds, and lead us from the age of science and art, reason and conscience, humanity and godliness, to find wisdom of the bulls of popes and liberty within the grates of confessionals ?

No ; despair is poor wisdom, and retreat is base strategy. Forward ! and God will be with us as with our fathers ; and in his own way he will gather us all together, and build into his new temple the marvellous elements of our mighty civilization. He will help us reconstruct society and religion upon the basis of liberty, and his elect prophets already are preparing the way. We must do what we can, and encourage his children to do their part, not doubting that every true man builds better than he knows ; and harmony beyond Orpheus' strains is singing the stones of the new temple into their places, where the walls shall be salvation and the gates praise.

In reading the Apocalypse lately, it seemed to me like a pictorial oratorio of the events and voices of the first century, with all the cries of the new prophets, who were calling the new Christian age out of the ruins of the old thrones and temples ; and I thought that painting and music might interpret that great drama better than any learned commentary. What art shall presume to interpret the apocalypse of the century just ended, 1768-1868 ? What composer shall set to music all those cries of fear and hope, hate and love, tribulation and triumph ? What a symphony that would be that should express any thing of the mental struggles measured by that period, and suggested by this centennial ! What whispers of doubt ! what yearnings for light ! what confessions of sorrow and sin ! what gleams of peace and joys of pardon ! what sighs for redemption, and jubilees of communion ! what clear and triumphal voices rise above all, and proclaim that God is with man, and mankind are his people ! The Hebrews, old and new, in synagogue and cathedral, are heard swelling

the temple chants; but the Greeks sing with them and sometimes without them. They have looked for the manifested God, and found him, and seen earth and heaven lighted up by the brightness. Hear them now, with our German sage and divine,—not least in the goodly company,—lifting up the great confession: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;” and echoing the brave word of their great compatriot Paul: “Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”

It is surely somewhat remarkable that the spiritual liberty that is so often feared as deadly to faith has been the inspiration of all the great ages of its restoration, and that now, throughout Christendom, the thought that is most devout and constructive affirms, with Schleiermacher, that God is in nature and history, in organic laws and continuous forces and institutions, not merely in individual souls; and, in Christ, his kingdom has its positive and dynamic centre of perpetual influence. Bunsen, and the host of liberal scholars in his Bible work, wear his mantle; and the more orthodox authors of the great Berlin “*Encyclopædia of Theology*,” with all their caution, pay reverent tribute to his name; whilst Roman Catholic scholars and thinkers see the largeness of his vision and love the charity of his spirit. The catalogue of his works makes a tract of itself, and the works of his critics and followers would make a library; whilst every year shows that the universal truth, back of the man and his sometimes wise and sometimes fanciful speculations, is greater than himself, or any thing that he has said or was ever said about him.

ART. V.—ARE THERE TWO RELIGIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT? *

IN a series of very interesting and valuable articles in the "Radical," published some time since, Mr. O. B. Frothingham attempted to show, that the person whom we call Jesus Christ was really compound and not simple,—that while Jesus was one person, Christ was another and a very different one. The first three Gospels describe Jesus; the fourth Gospel describes Christ. They differ, he says, in every way; are antagonist at all points; they cannot, by any possibility, be harmonized.

I.

Some of these contrasts are thus stated:—

JESUS is the personal name; CHRIST is the official title. *Jesus Christ* is equivalent to Jesus, the Messiah. Jesus is *the Man*, genealogically descended from David; baptized like others in the Jordan; tempted, tried, sorrowing; working miracles as other Hebrew prophets had done before; transfigured, as a man may be; forgiving sins, as the Son of man; human, though in no ordinary limits, but yet human.

But the fourth Gospel describes the Christ; and now we have THE WORD, in the bosom of the Father; not born, but manifested; with a body which can become invisible: nothing said of baptism, nothing of temptation, no Gethsemane of sorrow; a different trial and crucifixion,—all indicating the superhuman character of the victim.

Differing thus outwardly, the Jesus and the Christ also differed inwardly. The Jesus of Matthew is a simple teacher of truth. This Gospel contains the Sermon on the Mount, the homely parables, the ethics of the Sabbath, all that bears on man and human life. There is no technical theology, no

* The Radical, September, October, November, December, 1867; and January, 1868.

abstract teaching. He is a human prophet, ready to live and die for truth.

But the Christ of John is the eternal Word. No beatitudes, no parables; only orations against speculative unbelief, harangues about himself, as the Saviour. The Christ is no reformer or mystic, but a theologian. Jesus says, "Ye are the light of the world;" Christ says, "I am the light of the world." The one teaches immortality, declares the truth, indicates the way, invites to life, speaks of God, promises heaven. The other is immortality and life, is the truth and the way, manifests God, and is in heaven.

Jesus prays for himself — the Christ has no such need, and only prays for others. He tells his disciples to pray in his name; while Jesus teaches them simply to say, "Our Father." The miracles of Jesus are natural expressions of his benevolence; those of Christ are *signs* exhibiting his own glory.

According to Jesus, men are saved by natural goodness. The tree is known by its fruits. Not every one who says Lord! but he that does God's will, shall enter the kingdom. In the account of the last day in Matthew, men are saved by their deeds of love. But the Christ of John teaches that the duty is to believe on the Christ himself. Jesus teaches that men are saved by works, — Christ, that they are saved by faith. These two views are irreconcilable. The love to man, taught by Jesus, is universal charity, — that taught by Christ is love for those who share the same faith.

Again: the Christ teaches *doctrines*, — Jesus teaches *truths*. The Gospel of John contains the doctrine, (1) of an incommunicable God; (2) of a race lying in darkness; (3) of Christ as a mediator; (4) a hell for the disbelieving, a heaven for the believing; (5) a Holy Spirit. But in Matthew, no dogma, no metaphysics, but universal truth. The beliefs of Jesus are heart-beliefs, the God of Jesus is "Our Father," the man of Jesus one who can "be perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." His idea of goodness is human goodness; his hell is for all the mean, selfish, false; his heaven for those who do good in all lands and times.

Moreover, while Jesus desires to help society, and cause

God's kingdom to come in this world; while he came to preach to the poor, to deliver the captives, and cause God's will to be done on earth,—the Christ only wishes to save his disciples, to help his Church, to rescue souls hereafter. And, consequently, those who follow the Christ, rather than Jesus, have opposed reforms and defended old abuses and feared progress—while the words of Jesus have been the text of the reformer, the watchword of the philanthropist.

The conclusion of Mr. Frothingham is, that these two figures—Jesus and Christ—stand for two contradictory and irreconcilable systems. We can select one, or reject both; we cannot receive both. The Jesus is the more rational and truly spiritual,—hence it has all the authority on its side, and should be accepted,—while the Christ must be opposed and rejected. The Gospel of John is vague, abstruse, and talks more about Spirit,—but the Synoptic Gospels are more human, solid, plain; and so more really spiritual. John says, "God is Spirit," but does not define him. Matthew says he is one whose sun shines on the evil and the good. The Christ of John stands higher in the universe in rank,—but the Jesus of Matthew is higher in moral quality. Jesus convinces, Christ speaks by authority. Jesus lived an immortal life, and so best teaches immortality. The religion of Christ decays as the world grows; but the religion of Jesus is advancing.

But, though the highest love and faith is thus given by our writer to Jesus,—though he speaks of him as a true historic example of what men may become,—he closes in a tone which saddens us. After all, he says, it is of little practical consequence which of these two religions we accept, for neither of them is to be the faith of the future. Religion hereafter is to be, not historical or personal, but *scientific*. Therefore, all this inquiry is only a question of criticism, a matter of curious learning. We have not outgrown Jesus, nor left him behind, nor are we likely so to do. But we are to be, not his subjects, but his friends,—provided modern science allows us to be so, by not disproving his statements.

We have given an abridged but a fair statement of Mr.

Frothingham's position. Let us now examine it, and apply to it his own well-beloved criticism.

Three questions arise from the preceding review, —

I. Are these views of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel concerning the Great Person, *different*?

II. Are they *contradictory*?

III. How are they to be explained?

II.

That the views taken of Jesus Christ by the Synoptics, and by John, *differ*, has always been admitted, and emphasized, by the Christian Church. That John has added another view of his Master, to those which already prevailed, no one questions. He states his dogmatic and practical object himself, — “These were written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.”

Nor has any one ever denied that Jesus might be regarded from two very different points of view; either as the Son of man or as the Son of God. That is, he is described in his human character as having more of humanity than any other man, and so coming nearer to man than any other; and he is also described in his spiritual elevation, as being more full of the divine element, and coming nearer to God, than any other. In *every* man there is a human and a divine element; in Jesus each was more developed than in other men. There are times in which the good man comes out from God to commune with man; and other times in which he retires from man to commune with God. This duplex tendency all men possess. In some men, the one side is depressed in favor of the other; in other men, the case is reversed. Some men live a life of lonely thought, of solitary aspiration; they depart from their kind like St. Anthony on his column, or Thoreau in his cabin. In such men the element of humanity is depressed, that of the Spirit exalted. But in others we see the utmost kindness, perfect probity, all social and civil virtues; but not a whit of any contemplation or devout activity.

The saints call these worldly; while these call the saints mystical, fanatical, enthusiastic. The first class cling to Matthew and Luke, and have no taste for John; the others cleave to John, and ignore mostly the teachings of the three first Gospels.

We readily admit, therefore, as a well-known fact, that there are *different* views of Jesus Christ taken in the New Testament.

III.

But are they *contradictory*? We think not, — and for the following reasons: —

All the essential elements of the Jesus of Matthew are to be found in John.

The name JESUS occurs in John's Gospel as constantly as in that of Matthew.

Mr. Frothingham says, "The idea presented by the name Jesus is wholly inconsistent with the idea presented by the name Christ. The titles are in opposition; are mutually exclusive and neutralizing. Jesus is the proper name of a man; Christ indicates the function of an angel."

Mr. Frothingham then goes on to say, that "Matthew is devoted to Jesus, John is devoted to the Christ."

If so, one would naturally expect that the name Jesus would be used most frequently by Matthew, and the name Christ by John. Let us do as Mr. Frothingham directs: "Take up the New Testament. Note the occurrence of the two names, and their context of thought all through." What do we find? We find that the word Jesus occurs in Matthew one hundred and seventy-two times, and in John two hundred and fifty-four times; that it occurs *with* the title *Christ*, the *same* number of times in each, namely, three; and that the word *Christ*, *without* Jesus, occurs seventeen times in Matthew and twenty-one times in John. So far therefore as this distinction in the use of the two names is concerned, the Gospels do not as yet contradict each other. If Jesus is the name of *the man*, the Master is designated as a man more frequently in John than in Matthew.

John recognizes Jesus as the *Son of man*.

Mr. Frothingham considers this phrase as indicating the pure humanity of the Master. This is the only explanation which he can give of the passages in Matthew in which the highest power and privilege are ascribed to Jesus; in which it is said that he has power to forgive sins, to judge the world; that he is lord of the Sabbath; that he is to send forth his angels and come in his glory, and sit on the right hand of God. Such passages as these, occurring in the Synoptics, must be explained, or they wholly overthrow the theory of the "Two Religions in the New Testament." So Mr. Frothingham explains them by saying that all this is spoken of Jesus as a man, because he is spoken of in these places as "Son of man." "The Son of man on earth," says he, "is the representative of actual men and women;" and so he forgave, &c., "in his human capacity."

But if this be so, then the Christ Gospel ought not to speak of Jesus as "Son of man," but as "Son of God." What, then, are the facts? In Matthew, Jesus is called "Son of man" thirty-two times. In John, he is so called twelve times. But this number of twelve is sufficient, certainly, to show that John recognized the humanity of Jesus as fully, if not as frequently, as Matthew. And to compensate for this, we find that Jesus is called *Son of God* in Matthew fifteen times, and in John only eleven times. It is true, that John frequently calls Jesus simply "the Son," which might seem to indicate his divinity rather than his humanity. But that this is not so, and that "the Son" really means the Son of man, is evident from the following passages: In John v. 22, it is said that "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto THE SON." But five verses after (John v. 27) this is explained to mean Jesus as a man. "And hath given him power to execute judgment also, *because he is the Son of man*." So that the fourth Gospel places itself precisely on the same ground as the first, asserting that this great power belongs to Jesus, not as an angel, or a divine Word, *but as a man*.

So far, therefore, as the use of the phrases "Son of God" and "Son of man" indicate any thing, there is no contradiction between Matthew and John.

The Jesus of John has the same human relations and human character as the Jesus of Matthew.

Mr. Frothingham says (referring to the Logos in the introduction to John), "He has no mortal pedigree, no temporal descent, no earthly parentage, not even a mother." Of course this is true of the "Word," or Divine Revelation, which, after being manifested in creation and in human reason, was at last "made flesh" in Jesus. And so, if we were to personify the inspiration of a prophet or poet, the Divine Spirit which dwells in Isaiah or Dante, we must equally omit its "pedigree and earthly parentage," and only assert that it was with God in the beginning. But, certainly, when the fourth Gospel speaks of Jesus Christ, it places him in human relations. It twice calls him "the son of Joseph" (John i. 45, and vi. 42), ignoring the miraculous conception of the *human* gospels. It speaks of "his brothers" again and again; and notices that they did not believe in him,—a matter of small moment, one would think, to the Gospel which only knew him in his divine relation. "Not even a mother?" Which Gospel, so much as the fourth, makes us acquainted with the mother of Jesus? She appears at the beginning by his side, almost assisting him in his first miracle. The old relations of maternal authority and filial obedience still retain such a hold, that he is obliged to intimate to her that henceforth he must obey a higher direction,—*"Is not my hour come?"** Is the Christ of the fourth Gospel emancipated from earthly relations, who, even on the cross, remembers his mother, and gives her as a legacy to his best beloved disciple? In which Gospel is the tender friendship of Jesus for the family in Bethany most fully given? In which does Jesus shed human tears over the tomb of his friend? In which Gospel does he appear sympathizing with human joy as well as human sorrow, and working a miracle to add to the cheerfulness and merriment of a

* John ii. 5. *Οὐρα* is translated interrogatively in Matt. xv. 17, and xvi. 9.

wedding-feast; going further from an ascetic into a purely human religion than his disciples have as yet been able to follow? Which gives the story of his stepping over the limits of national prejudice — prejudice of sex and prejudice of virtue — to talk on a level of pure humanity with the sinful Samaritan woman? Which Gospel has the apotheosis of work, in that grand saying, "My Father worketh hitherto (down to this time), and I work," — a sentence which at once teaches the immanence of God in nature, opposes the literal interpretation of Scripture, and glorifies all labor as divine? In which Gospel is inserted, as naturally belonging there, the story of the compassion of Jesus for the woman taken in adultery? If John is the dogmatic Gospel, the metaphysical Gospel, apart from concrete life, how happen we to find in it such idyllic, concrete narratives as that of the man born blind (John, ch. ix.), and the raising of Lazarus (ch. xi.), than which no story is more tenderly and livingly human?

Mr. Frothingham calls attention to the fact, that the fourth Gospel contains no account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and explains that omission by supposing that Christ is himself the Lamb to be eaten. But the fourth Gospel *alone* contains the washing of the feet, — a sacrament of human service in which Jesus sets the example of serving his disciples, that they may serve one another; that is, the fourth Gospel omits the supper, the object of which is to commemorate Christ himself, and retains that in which Christ becomes the servant of others. And yet Mr. Frothingham thinks that "there is hardly in the whole book" (viz., John's Gospel) "a direct, natural word about the law of human sympathy," — and the Christ of John, he thinks, is absorbed with himself and his own glory, — "who says 'my glory' all the time!"

Four chapters in John (the 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th) are devoted to conversations, in which Jesus, forgetting his own approaching sorrow, exerts himself to comfort his disciples beforehand, and to prepare their hearts for their work; promising the Comforter, who will teach them what he is not

able to teach; urges on them, in all ways, to love each other; and ends with that sublime prayer, in which all the glory for which he asks is, that he may be the medium of eternal life to others. But, through all this Gospel, Mr. Frothingham sees only in Jesus egotism, self-seeking, and the desire for personal exaltation. Can any thing but the intellectual purpose of working out a preconceived opinion, have blinded a man usually so large and just, and always so keen and acute, to the open facts of the case before him?

But we must hasten on to another point.

All the essential elements of the Christ of John are to be found in the Synoptic Gospels. Thus, if the Christ of John is "the Son of God," so also is the Christ of the Synoptics. For example (Matt. iii.¹⁷), a voice is heard, from heaven, saying, at his baptism, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The devil, in the temptation, regards him as the Son of God (Matt. iv. 3): "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread," &c. On the Mount of Transfiguration the divine declaration is repeated (Matt. xvii. 5), "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him." The very devils, in the possessed (Matt. viii. 29), recognize him as "the Son of God." He was recognized by those on the ship as "the Son of God," when he walked on the sea in a storm (Matt. xiv. 33). The stupendous miracles at the crucifixion caused the centurion to say (Matt. xxvii. 54), "Truly this was the Son of God." The very title of the Gospel of Mark is, "The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." The angel in Luke (i. 35) announces to Mary that the holy thing born of her "shall be called the Son of God," because of his miraculous conception. It is evident, therefore, that the Synoptics, as well as John, regard Jesus, not only as the Son of man, but also as the SON OF GOD.

Again: the Christ of John speaks of himself, says Mr. Frothingham, in high terms, and is thus distinguished from the Jesus of the first three evangelists, who "calls attention to the truth, not to himself."

No doubt, for a reason hereafter to be assigned, Jesus says *more* of himself and his office and work in the fourth

Gospel than in the first. But see if he does not make essentially the same claims in these as in that.

He ascribes high value to faith in himself when he blessed Peter for his confession of him as the Christ, the Son of God (Matt. xvi. 17), and when he worked miracles for those who had faith in him. He declares (Matt. xxviii. 18), "All power is given TO ME in heaven and earth." In Luke xxi. 15, he says, "I will give you a mouth and a wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist." In Matt. xi. 27, he says, "All things are delivered UNTO ME of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." He then calls *all* who labor and are heavy laden to COME TO HIM for rest—not to God. He declares (Matt. xviii. 20) that wherever two or three are gathered IN HIS NAME, he is "in the midst of them." He says (Matt. x. 32), "Whosoever SHALL CONFESS ME before men, him will I also confess before my Father in heaven." And in the description of the judgment, he does not place God on the throne,—but describes himself as sitting there to judge "all the nations."

Without quoting more passages, it would seem sufficient to glance at these, to be satisfied that the Jesus of the Synoptics *does* "call attention to himself" as well as to the truth.

The Christ of John, says Mr. Frothingham, cares specially for his own disciples, prays for them, and not for the world. He wishes to save his Church, and to save souls hereafter.

And yet in Matthew, and not in John, are found the only two places in the four Gospels in which Jesus speaks of "his Church" and "the Church." In one, he says that he will build "his Church" on Peter, or on Peter's confession of himself; and in the other, he directs his disciples, if a brother offend them, as a last effort, to tell his fault "to the Church;" and if he will not hear the Church, to "let him be as a heathen man and a publican." It is in Mark, and not in John, that Jesus refuses to heal the woman of Canaan's daughter,—declaring that he was only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and "that it was not meet to take the children's bread, and give it to the dogs."

IV.

Again: we say that the different representations of Jesus in the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel can be reconciled without difficulty.

The Synoptic Gospels chiefly give an account of what Jesus said and did in Galilee; John, of what he said and did at Jerusalem. In Galilee, he was surrounded with simple, open-hearted people, who had no prejudices of position, no pride of opinion, but who were docile, and only needed to be taught. But at Jerusalem he met with a very different class, and yet a class very necessary to convince, if he were to accomplish his purpose of inducing the people to accept him as their Christ. The best of them were like Nicodemus, who was honest enough to admit the greatness of Jesus, but who could not "see the kingdom of God" as Jesus taught it. But most of them were ready to oppose and denounce him as an impostor, a demagogue, a liar, a deceiver of the people. With this class of men, — the men in power; the men thought to be most orthodox, most religious; the men of influence, rank, and station, who looked with metropolitan contempt on this peasant-prophet from the rural districts, — Jesus talked face to face as an equal, and more than an equal. He shrank from no discussion, he maintained his position against them all. He was personal, was he? Yes: he defended himself when attacked. Surrounded by men thirsting for his blood, and the object of bitter invective, he told their proud aristocratic priests that in their spirit and temper they were from beneath, and that he was from above. Conscious of his own fulness of truth, conscious of the immense power and beauty of the divine laws he had to communicate, he told them he was living bread come down from heaven. Do you call it *egotism* that he told them to believe in him? Believing in him was believing in God's truth and God's love. What prophet of the eternal right has not seemed presumptuous, egotistic, severe, to the men who always confound hatred of sin with personal passion, scorn of meanness with bad-temper, and entire confidence in one's own convictions with vanity

and self-conceit. It is very easy for us, looking across the eighteen centuries between, and criticising Jesus from our quiet studies and peaceful pulpits, to object to that intense faith, and that lightning-flash of utterance, which has dispelled the darkness of the world, and enabled us to be what we are and where we are. How often are we tempted to be tired of hearing Aristides called *The Just*, and to prefer some poor novelty of the present hour, some tawdry poetaster of the day, some flimsy prophet of the newest newness, to the Dantes and Ezekiels, the Washingtons and Pauls!

The view which the fourth Gospel gives of Jesus, though differing from that of the three other Gospels, is very necessary to complete the picture of the great personality of the Master. It is fortunate for us that this disciple was gifted with the quality of soul which enabled him to understand the value of what the other disciples did not hear, or were not able to comprehend. In the three Synoptics, we have the Prince of Peace; in the fourth, the Lion of the tribe of Judah. We here see love, with the sharp edge of truth to it. We see that this majestic soul, so tender to the despairing, the outcast, the sinful, could turn with terrible anger against the hypocrites in high places, the men who made a trade of religion. Those men possessed absolute power. Their word was law, their authority uncontested, till this man from the shore of Galilee came, and, with no prestige and no weapon but the sharp sword of truth, cut through all their pretension, and brought down their power. And yet those who admire the same thing in Theodore Parker or William Lloyd Garrison, complain of the Christ of John as "unhuman, unnatural, unfriendly and assuming in the very highest degree."

In John, also, we see the Jesus of the Synoptics fulfilled in another direction. To all lives there are two sides, — the human-natural and the ideal-supernatural. In great lives, these two are more fully marked. Men live spontaneously, from their natural instincts; they live purposely, according to their convictions and deliberate choice. In each of us, when

grown to mental manhood, appears this combination of the natural and ideal life. The statesman, in his office, holds all day in his hand the helm of state; he comes home at night, and his children climb on his back, pull his hair, and make a plaything of the face that even brave men scarcely dare to look upon steadily. Luther hurls thunderbolts of argument, invective, corrosive criticism, at the mightiest power in Christendom, and then turns to write a letter about fairies to his little John.

Mr. Frothingham has described well and lovingly the natural beauty of the life of Jesus. He has shown us his out-flowing good-will, his natural piety, his spontaneous charity. There was no condescension in his treatment of any one. He talked with the Samaritan woman with such a human sense of equality, that his disciples were surprised. But the disciples, no less than the woman, stood outside of his soul, and were incapable of communing with him in his ideal nature. Peter had a momentary glimpse of it; and saw that this synthesis of perfect Truth and perfect Love must be the true Christ of God. But John has given us a fuller view of the ideal Jesus: of his thought, his purpose, his aim. By some natural sympathy of intellect with ideas, and by being (as it would seem) a companion, oftener than the others, of Jesus in his journeys to the feasts, John caught more frequent sight of the deep and lofty *aims* of the Master. We do not think that he himself understood fully much of what he has reported. We think that it is given confusedly, and needs much critical study before we can see clearly what was in the mind of Jesus in these utterances. Thus far, no commentators have found the key to unlock this treasury. But here, in John's Gospel, is the *mind* of the Master; here, if anywhere, is one day to be found the explanation of his career. When the critic comes who can *read between the lines*, who can see what was meant in what is reported, who can supply the missing portions of these fragments, who can restore the links which are wanting to this divine Torso, then it will be seen what a mine of pure gold is in the fourth Gospel, —

Volat avis sine meta
Quo nec vates, nec propheta,
Evolavit altius.
Tam implenda quam impleta,
Nunquam vidit tot secreta
Purus homo purius.

Such a critic, however, must adopt a different method from that which is now popular. Goethe has described the difference between destructive and constructive criticism in a few admirable sentences. The test of true criticism, that which distinguishes it from false, is that it results in giving us something, not in merely taking something away. Here is a Gospel, universally accepted in the Church at the end of the second century as authentic. The churches of Asia, Africa, and Europe, were unanimous in attributing it to the apostle John. It has been the light, strength, peace, inspiration, of millions, from that time to the present. At last some critics come, trained in the methods of analysis, accustomed to look for discrepancies and contradictions, and they proceed to dissect it. It dies under their knife. They find, as they look at it, numerous difficulties. It disagrees with the other Gospels on this point and that. It differs here from Matthew; then its author must be mistaken. It omits this story, related by Luke; then its writer did not know it. It agrees too nearly with the Synoptics in one place; then it must be imitating their style and copying their facts. It agrees too little with them in another place; then it is plainly in error, and a bungling impostor. Besides this, the critic is always imputing a secret motive to the writer. The object is to teach his Logos-theology. If he omits the Transfiguration, it is because of his dogmatic purpose, which that miracle does not suit. If he inserts something not in the Synoptics, he has invented it, to give color to his theory about Christ. Thus the simplicity and truth of the narrative are gradually resolved into a lie, —and an empty lie. We are taught to study the book, not with faith, but with suspicion. It ceases to have any human interest to us. Even such sublime utterances as “God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth,” are let down to some commonplace level

of vague declamation. Even such tender utterances as "a new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another," are interpreted as inculcating only a narrow, exclusive, sectarian interest in those only who believe as we do. The result, therefore, of this kind of criticism is purely destructive. It leaves the mind and heart empty; it leaves the phenomenon unexplained, which it sought to solve. Here are mighty effects, and no cause; here is a book which sways and moves the hearts of millions for thousands of years, and now it turns out to be an imposition and a falsehood. Such a result is a reproach to human nature, and teaches us to despise the operations of the human mind. It discredits humanity and natural reason, in the interest of a fractional part of the intellect called the critical faculty. It ends in despair. It must, therefore, be a false method, since it puts us on a path which results in nullities. It is like Mr. Emerson's western road, which became a wagon-path, then a horse-path, and finally ended in a squirrel-track, and ran up a tree.

Truth divorced from love ceases to be truth; just as love divorced from truth ceases to be love. The love of truth is the search for *realities*. It looks for the real, not the apparent; for the substantial, not the phenomenal; for the true, not the false. It has faith in human instincts, human testimony, human belief; it uses analytic criticism to separate the false, and so to leave the true more glorious than before; it breaks the shell, that it may take out and keep the kernel. If it criticises any great belief, any wide-spread faith, any long-established doctrine, any superstition, mythology, or rooted prejudice, it is to find the kernel of truth within the husk of error. But false criticism is satisfied with destruction. It exposes ignorance, folly, imposition, contradiction,—and stops. There is always a light sneer on its lips,—a self-satisfied and contemptuous smile made up of its content with its own logic, and its scorn of the weakness of its prey.

Our complaint, therefore, with "radical" criticism is, that it is not radical enough. It stops on the surface where error lingers, and does not go down to the depths where truth

abides for ever. Radical criticism, in examining any phenomenon of human faith, whether it be Buddhism, witchcraft, or the Gospel of John, will not rest in denial, but proceed to find the reality and truth below the letter of error. Till it has done that, it has done nothing, and its work will pass away; till it has done that, even its destructive work is ineffectual: for when an error holds a truth in its embrace, the truth gives immortality even to the error. How often has Unitarian criticism shown the logical absurdity of the Trinity and of other Orthodox doctrines! But failing to find the truth in those doctrines, its assaults on the errors have been ineffectual. And so you may logically establish the contradictions and inconsistencies of the fourth Gospel to any extent, and you do not shake the faith of the Church in this sacred record. But when you detect discrepancy in order to plant the truth on a firmer foundation, you then carry with you both the mind and the heart of those who love the truth.

This, therefore, is the work which remains for a really radical criticism to do. Let it show how the character of the Master may appear in this Gospel, different from that in the others, because seen by a different observer and from a different point of view. Let it show how the aged apostle, having passed through a long and deep experience, had become himself a different man from his early self, and so saw Christ with different eyes. Let it give us a picture of the old man, surrounded by his disciples, relating facts and conversations out of his Master's life, which they write down from his lips, as given in the fragmentary manner of age, summoning its reminiscences. Let it show how here and there John may thus have mixed his own thoughts with the words of his Master, and given a free translation, rather than a perfect report, of his sayings. Let it re-arrange these fragments, and put them in a better order. Let it supply the chasms and gaps in the narration. So by degrees we shall arrive at the sight of truth, not the detection of falsehood. So we shall preserve our faith in human nature and human testimony, and yet allow the critical understanding its full rights.

In what we have said, we do not mean to class Mr. Froth-

ingham among those whose criticism is only of the destructive order. In these very papers, he has repeatedly shown the opposite spirit, and has given us positive as well as negative results. Yet his criticism, as a whole, seems to be vitiated by a negative prepossession, — a determination to establish a theorem of discordance. Nevertheless we end, as we began, with the opinion that his articles are both interesting and valuable. Such an investigation, when ably conducted, must always be interesting, for no look into the life of Jesus but must repay our study. And instructive also, for so keen an observer as Mr. Frothingham constantly suggests hints which lead to new views of the life of Jesus. And even when we differ from him, we are indebted to him for his transparent statements, his manly and temperate intellectual courage, his well-trained skill in argument, and his full use of all the apparatus of modern thought.

ART. VI. — THE FUTURE OF THE MINISTRY, AND THE
MINISTRY OF THE FUTURE.

Year-Book of the American Unitarian Association. 1869.

THE attention of the public has been called more than once to the very remarkable statistics which we find in this little volume. In a list of three hundred and eighty-four preachers registered as belonging to the denomination, and still connected by ties stricter or looser with the profession, one hundred and fifty are marked as unconnected with any parish, against eighty vacant parishes. Allowing a large margin for those disabled by age or infirmity, or occupying other public positions of professional service, there are probably a full hundred amply able and reasonably qualified for the discharge of the clerical function; but of these we are told, again, that "less than fifty are candidates for settlement;" at the same time that "they are willing and anxious to do what in them lies to carry on the work to which they were called,

and gave themselves in early life." * Somehow, the change has come about, which, in so large a proportion of cases, does not identify the "work" with the "settlement," which, even so late as five and twenty years ago, was considered its ample, if not its only, opportunity. The "work of the ministry" has somehow got dissociated from the idea of pastorship and permanence; and that, not merely in parishes that have been drifting towards the natural results of the voluntary system, but in the class of men who have identified their aim, ambition, hope, and success in life with this one thing.

And this, at a time when the profession holds, in some respects, a position more flattering, more conspicuous, more responsible than ever. The "prizes" of success in professional life were never so many or so brilliant, to judge from outward indications. There was never a time in the history of the liberal pulpit when one man's voice could be heard by groups and masses of uncloyed auditors, week after week, numbering by hundreds, and even by thousands; when the forms of worship he conducts exhibited, on one hand, such costliness, taste, and skill, — or, in other cases, had such simple and hearty hearing; when the press so gave echo to every strong word and every telling stroke struck by the men in public favor; when a popular speaker, or a skilful organizer, or a strenuous worker, was so sure of large appreciation and generous upholding; when so much was done, so liberally, to provide for the future wants of the church and ministry among us; when the pecuniary bounty of the congregation kept such pace with the demands of a costly and elegant style of living made in a luxurious age. Doubtless the prizes of gross gain and wealth are more tempting in other callings. But to the successful preacher, — to one even of modest and moderate success, — there is a fair sufficiency of this also; and along with it there glitters on the surface another sort of reward, far more tempting to the generous ambition of youth. To judge by all that comes by way of newspaper announcements, the work was never so attractive, or its reward so sure.

* See *Liberal Christian* for Feb. 6, 1869.

To look attentively at a single item of its statistics shows that there are influences at work, not so willingly acknowledged or so easily understood, which make us think that some further, and perhaps yet more radical, change is inevitable.

We shall not dwell again on the symptoms which we discussed a year ago,* as showing the results and tendencies of the voluntary system in our New-England parishes. Nor shall we speak of that great change in the habits of thinking, and the *personnel* of the profession, obvious enough to one who has known it somewhat intimately for a single generation, and suggested irresistibly when we think of the probabilities of the next ten years. That we are approaching something better than the placid stability of fifty years ago, and better than the anxious unrest of the last twenty-five, we will not suffer ourselves to doubt. But it is clear that the elements which have served for the discussion of ministerial work and opportunity in the past will not be sufficient for the future; and that, if we are to approach that future intelligently, so as to use its conditions to the best advantage, we need distinct, deliberate, and patient study of them, as of one of the incidental problems of that "Social Science" whose importance is first made known in our day.

There is a sense, indeed, in which the profession of the Christian ministry has a special claim on the student of Social Science. Partly, because of the very intimate way in which it has been identified with the moral culture and foremost progress of thought in our own country since its settlement down to a very recent period, — as we have illustrated in one or two points heretofore; partly, also, because of the glare of publicity which attends its goings-on, from the fact of a "religious public" of which it is ostensibly the moving force; but, still more, because it accurately represents the average thought and moral life which the community will accept in any large measure, and agree to support and register among the recognized things and "institutions" of modern society. It is a matter of much higher interest to the student of pure

* See Christian Examiner for March, 1868.

truth, to study the lessons of such a thinker as Mill or Herbert Spencer, or the arguments of such critics as Colenso and Renan, or the metaphysics of the later school of Hegel, or the labors of a patient and wise explorer like Bunsen in the wide field of universal knowledge. But thinkers in advance of their own generation are but slowly assimilating and working out the ideas which will govern the world two or three generations hence. To one who wishes to keep intelligently abreast of his time, and take part in its genuine work, and wield any thing of the moral forces which are actually potent in human affairs, we maintain that there is no more interesting and no more profitable study, than that which seeks to understand how it is that the organized institutions of piety and moral culture are slowly and painfully adjusting themselves to the new manners, the new motives, and the new wants of the present day.

For our point of departure, we take the steady routine of parish and ministerial work as it was understood fifty years ago, and is still most familiar to the common thought about such things. The parish system, as we have understood it, was the growth, partly of the Protestant movement, appealing to the private reason and conscience, and aiming at the personal conversion of individuals, their rescue from evil courses or tendencies, and their watchful training in the principles of the Christian life; partly of the condition of things under which local parishes had been organized in the New-England colonies, and had gradually shaped themselves under the changes brought about in later times. It is what we take for granted in our training for the ministry, in our exhortation to its duties, and in our appeals to the public for its support. And any marked and visible modification of it has come about within quite recent memory. Those of us who have scarce yet reached the sober estate of middle life, were learners in the first Sunday schools engrafted on our New-England church system: in fact, it is not many years since Sunday schools were discarded as innovations by some of our own churches in Boston. Persons not yet aged still remember the fervor of conviction with which Dr. Tuck-

erman brought home to the conscience of our churches the fact, that, as then organized, they made no stated or accessible provision for the ignorant and poor, — when the ministry-at-large was organized, largely through the seconding of his own effort by the earnest sympathy of Channing. Judging from the point of view of the ancient parish, there were two definite steps, outside the beaten track, in the direction of missionary work. They were the first clear response to the appeal, made so emphatically, under the altered circumstances of the time, declaring the failure of pure Congregationalism to meet the deepest wants of modern society. Protestantism itself, as then organized, seemed to have grown into a religion for the few, the respectable, the educated, — a special culture for the classes standing in least need of religious instruction and control; while the perishing and the dangerous and the unbelieving classes, that grow up so fast in the great centres of modern life, stood quite outside the pale of acknowledged Christian influences.

For contrast, take the work that is attempted by liberal Christianity to-day. It will not be invidious if we assume Boston as the headquarters of theological liberalism in this country; or an unfair test of its activity, if we look at what is done here on a single Sunday of this winter; or disparaging to other sects, Catholic or Protestant, if we consider only the work of those with whom we are most nearly affiliated ourselves. The little annual we have cited gives, in the first place, a list of twenty-two religious societies of the Unitarian connection in Boston, dating all the way from 1630 to 1868 in the dates of their foundation, six of them within the last sixteen years. Three of these are professedly missionary churches for religious and charitable offices amongst the poor, — the oldest of them established in 1826; three others are, by their constitution, open to the public, with seats absolutely free. Of these last, the "New South" devotes to this service an ancient name and an established fund; the "Church of the Disciples" occupies new and ample accommodations, the free gift of its members and well-wishers within the year; and the third is the noble congregation, of

upwards of two thousand, gathering weekly in the Music Hall, — a congregation as constant, as attentive, as serious in aspect, as that we have seen in any of our houses of worship, — drawn together, partly by the preacher's laboriously earned reputation for independent and cultivated thought, partly by the attractions of music prepared with an ample and lavish liberality. This last is especially interesting, as an experiment of a service cut quite loose from the trammels of ecclesiasticism and routine, and adjusting itself easily to the tone of modern knowledge and thought, — with a freedom which any preacher or philosopher might covet, — but not letting go the homelier opportunities of the Sunday school and the "Sewing Circle." To all these, with the group of religious activities clustered about each, we may add the great throngs that gather at evening in the Theatre, where the preaching has been noted as especially serious, devout, and practical, as far removed as possible from what would be called "theatrical." And we may include, besides, the discussions of the afternoon at Horticultural Hall, initiated by the "Free Religious Association," and dealing in a very direct and serious way with the religious questions that nearest affect men's thought, character, and institutions.

These are some of the agencies which a liberal Christianity is bringing to bear, week after week, upon the work demanded of religion in our time. What some would regard, perhaps, as the most striking thing about it, — it is *all* of it, probably, done without the least reference to, or consciousness of, any of the theological dogmas which have vexed Christendom in the past. The name "Unitarian," or the name "Liberal," covers an almost absolute indifference to the formulas of any creed. We do not pretend, that the agencies we have spoken of are a very grand, a very successful, or any way a sufficient, interpretation of religion to the world. Doubtless, they are often stale and weak from routine, often poorly comprehended, often unwisely administered. Especially, they are feeble to what they might be, for want of thorough system and co-operation, that would unite them consciously in a single end. Liberal Christianity is so

large a thing, and the culture of the time has trained its best friends and advocates in ways so various, that those who should have one aim and hope are often jealous of one another's ways, and are suspicious of the large freedom in which the Lord's service consists. Protestantism, and especially that extreme form of it which we have inherited, is no match for the splendid equipment, the long discipline, the perfect skill, the complete subordination, which the Church of Rome finds in its trained defenders and extenders. But Protestantism, even in this, its loosest and weakest form, has been conscious of those wants of mankind which nothing but organized religious action can ever meet; and has, however imperfectly, made a distinct effort to meet them. It has responded in sincerity to the demand made in the circumstances of the time, and has shown how elastic a thing is practical Christianity, in its methods for meeting the work it has to do.

For, after all, the agencies we have spoken of are not regarded — it is against our whole religious theory to regard them — as *doing the work* of Christianity. At best, they are only the authentic and public exposition of the way in which we think that work should be done; and, possibly, some little direct help towards doing it. The work of religion, according to our notion, does not consist in religious exercises, or acts of conversion. These are only the preparation of the heart to meet the issues of life. Even as the equipment and machinery of religion, they have only gone along and kept pace with many other things, in which many of us think the work of true religion is more effectually done; such as improved modes of education, the organizing of public charities, the urging forward of particular tasks of social or political reforms. All these are included in that large sphere of the "spiritual power" which it was the aim and boast of Catholicism to embrace in the compass of its agencies. And the special forms of ecclesiastical or denominational activity among us, consist no more in those examples of "church extension" we have enumerated, than they do in the organizing of "conferences" and "unions;" and the very various

ways in which the "lay element" of our religious community has been brought into new activity among us.

What we wish, first of all, is to get as clear a consciousness as possible of those religious energies, — some new, some old, — which, in the disjointed way they work, we sometimes forget the existence of at all. And, next, to point out the fact, that this great increase of organized activity, in so many directions, is *a part of the same phenomenon* we observe, when we complain of the restlessness and unsettled condition of parish life among us. The fact of this unsettled condition is told most shortly and plainly, in the figures of the register before cited, from which we learn that of two hundred and twenty-two parish settlements, one hundred and five, or nearly one-half, date within the last three years; — full one-half, probably, if we reckon only the names of men in active service. Some of the more general causes of it, in the conditions of parish existence at the present day, we briefly traced a year ago. That it has something to do with the same mental and spiritual activity which we have seen in other directions, is apparent as soon as we analyze an average case or two. The reason of the broken and brief ministries so common now, is often as slight, apparently, as it is difficult to define. In one case, it is a political indiscretion, or an excess of reformatory zeal; in another, a difference of theological views; in another, the prospect of a better settlement. But the determining element in many a case, we should think, will be, simply, that a good and faithful man has really done his work in one place, and had better go to another. And this gets by degrees recognized as no discreditable reason for a change. The late Ephraim Peabody — one of the wisest, most faithful, most successful and beloved of ministers — used to say, as the result of his ripe experience, that three years was a sufficient ministry for most men, in a single place; that seven years was a long term of service for any man; and that circumstances would rarely justify one in staying as long as ten. The phrase was epigrammatically worded, but it answered to a fact. And the hardship, often, of the individual case, need not blind us to the necessity or the advan-

tage. It is true that personal force — that is, moral force — is generally spent most effectively in one persistent, long-continued series of efforts on the same material. And, with all our disposition to reconcile ourselves to the drift of things we see, we incline still to think the most useful, the most serviceable, the most desirable work, after all, is done under those “old-fashioned” ministries which employ and reward the best strength of a lifetime. But often, again, the healthiest and best action of the mind — from which, after all, a man’s best strength must grow — can be had only by change of circumstance. It is a wisdom not always given to a man to discern when it is so; and often he will rebel and protest against that kindly leading of circumstance which compels him to accept a verdict he should have anticipated. But when we consider how many are the conditions of the largest and truest culture, and how few of them can ordinarily be met under the same surroundings, we cannot doubt that some special uses will be served by that variety in experience, and that alternation of service, which are required of most men in the profession now. With average gifts, it is the only way we can easily conceive of that “effectual calling” which should fit any large number of men for the greatly varied and extended ministrations of religion in our day.

And all the more, because the service of religion gets less and less identified with any set office or any class of men. Having accepted voluntaryism, for better or worse, having done our utmost to make religion a matter of individual choice and will, we must be prepared for the legitimate result. The “free-church system,” which is the ripe fruit of the voluntary system, is also its final stage. It will have its perfect work in a church-system that dispenses with all official and permanent administration whatever. We see “no temple and no altar therein,” still less a trained and salaried priesthood. Once well organized, equipped, and vitalized, its efficiency depends more on the real need and value of the work it does, than on the particular hands it does them by. Take the “Christian Unity” in Providence, for example, whose agencies are shaped out precisely by the need it

attempts to meet, and which therefore gives the nearest type of the sort of institutions we may look for in the future. The conditions of its work, indeed, are found by the liberality of a few, whose heart has been very much drawn to it and set upon it. But the work itself is done by the voluntary help of many. Its nucleus is an organized society, with its four sections, its working committees, and its alternations of responsible charge. Its local habitation is a group of rooms, easy of access, and adapted to the most plain and practical uses. Here it gathers, night after night, its one or two or three hundred persons,—many of them drawn in from sheer wandering and exposure of the streets, laboring men and boys and women,—and occupies them with reading, or simple games, or excellent music, or the occasional delight of choice works of art,—a wholesome, clear, and cheerful influence shed upon many of the coarse and hard by-ways of city life. The ideal is, of a great, busy, cheerful, intelligent family,—not a chapel or conference-meeting. A library above, a lecture-hall at one side, complete the equipment. On Sunday, billiard and croquet are decently draped from view, the chequer-board is put aside, the newspaper-file is closed, and the assembly-room is turned into a chapel, for simple exercises of worship (like a great family, again, in its Sunday dress), and for teaching or discussion among groups gathered of all who will,—a school that never lacks its faithful teachers and its interested pupils. Its cluster of active, voluntary agencies, includes worship, instruction, companionship, charity, wholesome and innocent amusement. Its pliant force is limited only by the actual wants it recognizes and attempts to meet. It has its funds, its officers, its badged volunteer police. It can expand its system, on one side, into a course of public lectures, or a show of art; on the other side, into private visits of charity, or watchful care of some young, friendless person, exposed to the perils of city life. It has grown out of the life of Christian churches about it, and is only one of the practical directions that life has taken. But, in itself, all the work it does is voluntary, unprofessional, and unpaid. In short, it is a lay Christian church, as inde-

pendent of a "hireling ministry" as a Society of Friends. And in this it illustrates a drift of things which our attention is often called to, and which we shall do well to take heed of in our ecclesiastical theories.

The same drift is seen in other things. The Church of the future, as we may fairly infer, will rely a good deal less on permanent and professional functions of a ministry; a good deal more on special services, had for the occasion, and adjusted to the special fitnesses of the men who render them. There is no obvious reason why one man should have in charge all the varied offices of pastor and teacher, of preacher, adviser, comforter, and friend, that make up the task of a high spiritual culture; or why a man of singular gifts of public utterance should be especially set apart to a single congregation. The lecture system has been making us familiar, these thirty years, with the notion that a successful preacher belongs, in a very real sense, to the public at large. Some of the best missionaries of the advanced thought of the age have been men taken fresh from the walks of pastoral life,—regularly bestowing a month or two out of the busiest working season of the year upon service in other places. If obliged to choose between their narrower and their wider sphere, how many of them would take the former? There is the testimony, again, given at the late Conference in New York, in favor of a great diversity of ministrations, as best both for preacher and people: once a month, it was said, was better than every week, for him to address his own. But, under such a dispensation, which, after all, would be "his own"? The experiment of "theatre preaching" seems to be not merely a chance stroke, or feeler, put forth to secure the immediate transient effect; but rather a definite step of transition, a feeling-out of the way by which the best talent is to be economized and used to the best advantage. There are men of admirable gifts, whose "fit audience" is always few,—in a close-drawn congregation of perhaps fifty or a hundred. And there are men of different gifts, whose audience, in justice to them and to the public, ought to count by thousands. Why should one rule, one method, one way of life, be ex-

pected of them all? Often it may happen, that a modest man will never know his own powers, and never have a fair appreciation from his best friends, until he has been proved by some grand public opportunity. The liberal church is feeling out its stores of reserved strength. The modern public inclines to move, to meet, to listen, in great masses,—as next summer's musical jubilee must build its amphitheatre for fifty thousand auditors. The gift of eloquent speech is too costly a gift for multiplied and limited boundaries. Something may be lost, but more will be gained. Preaching may be less than it has been a matter of refined and special culture: it must be more than it has been a public function and a social force. And this is the way we read the experience of the time. Mere numbers are often what makes the occasion genuine, and give the needed backing to the speaker's words. Compare the interest of a Music-Hall assembly, or a theatre audience, with the cold routine-service of an average Sunday afternoon,—and the power of the same man, the same thought, the same words, is seen to be multiplied more than a hundred-fold.

At the same time, this glare of publicity offers the sharpest contrast to the old neighborly and domestic relation between pastor and people. Every movement in that direction is a movement away from that intimate and dear relationship which makes so much of our traditional notion of what the profession should do and be. Something of the same sort is true of that more perfect parish organization which has come about; of the larger freedom of our conferences; of the grand, and, in the main, healthy stimulus to religious zeal in our theatre preaching. Whatever tends, on one side, to develop lay action in religious things; or, on the other, to specialize the function of mere preaching,—is a step from the old order of things towards the new. In fact, why should not much of the "pastoral" work, once held purely professional, be better done by committees, or by persons singled out for their fitness for that special thing? A visitor of the sick, or a comforter of the poor, in the church's name, need not, as a thing of course, be its official minister,—perhaps

inexperienced, perhaps unskilled, perhaps called to a distance by a thousand public cares. Often that service would be far better done by wise, strong-hearted, and tender women, such as we all have known. A ministry of men alone misses one of the hemispheres of Christian agency, — as we have strongly felt when listening to the warm, free, flowing speech of a female preacher. And, if women are generally shut off from the public functions of the ministry, all the more reason that they should fulfil its private offices. So sometimes it happens, that a congregation which has been for months without a settled minister, is surprised to find that it has developed a zeal, a common feeling, a habit of co-operating in church interests, that give it the sense of a new life and strength; and, except by some fortunate flow of this new feeling towards a man spontaneously recognized as the one fit minister, any effort to secure a settled pastorate is only the signal for division and distrust.

These are signs of the times which we cannot avoid heeding in our efforts at church extension. It is part of the same thing, that many preachers distinctly prefer not to assume permanent relations with any parish. Special acts of service, limited terms of service, and such a variety of it as to meet the variety of minds to which it is addressed, — such is the order of things which some have adopted already from deliberate choice, and many others are accepting from clear necessity. Such is the lesson which we find in the brief statistics we have copied, explained by the facts themselves which they record. It will be wise for men of the profession most nearly interested in this changed condition of things, to accept it intelligently and hopefully. No symptoms whatever are yet apparent of a return to the stable and lifelong ministries of our fathers. Rather, we are surprised, every now and then, by some new symptom of the rapidity with which the change is taking place. It is a number, more and more limited, of men of rare and peculiar gifts, who will be able or likely to give themselves to the exclusive service of the ministry. Rather it must take its place — in the thoughts of the profession itself, as in the mind of the community at large —

among various secular occupations (as we call them) equally honorable and useful. That it should be strong in its ancient prestige and class associations, is daily becoming more and more impossible. It must be strong in its self-respect; strong in the co-operation and mutual honor of its members; strong in the actual service it renders to the highest interests of human society. Changes, such as those we have noted, call more urgently than ever for right understanding and a common spirit among those who have undertaken this special line of service. And for the able, the faithful, the willing workman, the work will never long be wanting to the hand.

ART. VII.—THE CHURCH DOGMA OF THE TRINITY.

Letters on the Divine Trinity, addressed to Henry Ward Beecher.

By B. F. BARRETT. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

THE title of these letters, and the curious modification of the trinitarian dogma proposed by Mr. Barrett, from the point of view of Swedenborgianism, are an evidence both of the extraordinary vitality of the doctrine against which Unitarianism is an organized protest, and an indication that a few plain words about it are neither obsolete nor out of season now.

The only text in the Bible which is sometimes asserted to express distinctly the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the unity of the Deity, is the famous 1 John v. 7. Were the genuineness of this text admitted, however, the doctrine derived from it would by no means follow. All that the language proves is, that there are three witnesses in heaven that agree in the same testimony. There is no intimation here of any other kind of unity. On the contrary, there is a positive implication the other way. It is the *testimony* only that is one. The special force of the argument lies in the fact, that the witnesses are *three*; and the value of their concurrent testimony immediately disappears, if they are only the same witness in three different disguises. In

short, this famous text gives no support to the popular doctrine of the Trinity.

This, however, is said, not from the smallest suspicion that the text *is* genuine. There never was a question of biblical criticism more completely settled than the utter spuriousness of this passage. Orthodox critics of learning and candor express themselves as unspeakably ashamed of the scholarship and the honesty which allow some Trinitarians still to assert its genuineness, and to base the fundamental dogma of orthodoxy upon it as its corner-stone.

It is not, however, this text, or any number of texts, that keeps the Trinity in its place of respect and importance in the Church and the world ; but rather the doctrine itself that keeps the text in countenance. There has always been a trinity in the faith of the world, whether in philosophy, poetry, or theology ; and we presume there always will be. Of all religious philosophies, that of the Old and New Testaments contains least of a trinity ; any other religion has more of it than the Jewish or Christian, and most systems of speculation a good deal more. Not a fortieth part of the evidence for any such dogma can be brought out of the New Testament which can be adduced from Platonic philosophy and the pagan scriptures. The paucity of authority for a trinity of any sort in the Gospels is to be ascribed to the unphilosophical, unlearned, and practical character of those writings, and to their supreme devotion to the idea of the sole sovereignty and fatherhood and unity of God. It was not until the ardor and force of this original simplicity had expended itself, that a trinity — which, in some form, we might so naturally have expected to find accompanying the original revelation — crept into the mouths of Christian disciples. It was already in their culture, their superstitions, their experience. Christ's plainness and the apostolic simplicity had repressed it. But it was against experience, history, philosophy, to have a religion without *some* sort of trinity in it ; and therefore, when the Alexandrian philosophers began to mix the gospel with their Platonism, it was a real relief to the mind and heart of the world. Christianity

was corrupted, it is true; but it was popularized. Trinitarianism was probably the only possible form in which the gospel could have survived the philosophies and false religions which threatened to engulf it. By taking just so much of their cargo aboard as warranted the wearing of their colors, the gospel ship might be permitted to pass through the hostile fleet that, but for their own flag at the mast-head, would have sunk it before it was fairly out of port.

But we have still much to account for in the origin and vitality of Trinitarianism, and its survival of the ages of critical light which have sifted the records and the theology of the Church. There are many learned books in support of the popular dogma of the Trinity, whose drift is the eternal threeness running through nature, the human constitution, and the religions and philosophies of the ancient world. It is obvious enough, that this argument has two edges,—one for and one against the conclusion it would enforce. For those who deny the scripturality of the Trinity, sufficiently account for its origin and spread by pointing to the ancient opinions and proclivities out of which it grew; while those who assert it, find powerful backers in these pre-existent theories. That ancient religions and philosophies, in precise proportion to their purity and influence, contained either the germs or the anticipations of the religion of Christ, will not be disputed by candid and thoughtful minds; but that popular Christianity contains the truths of the gospel in heathen and pagan vessels—that its essential doctrines are embodied in non-essential formulas of an origin both older and less authoritative than the gospel—is also not likely to be denied by scholars who are not partisans, and by thoroughly honest and fearless investigators.

Nor, again, are we to suppose that even all the *truths* now embodied in our religion were derived from its own fountain; or that all the additions, enlargements, or modifications, which it early received from the pagan mind, or, later, from science, philosophy, and experience, are so many corruptions, deformities, and defeats of its intention. The gospel was poured into the life of the world, to mix with it; emptied

into the human mind, to take on the shape which nature and experience had given that mind. It was contributed to history as the Missouri empties into the Mississippi, doubling its volume, changing its color, and doubtless altering its destiny, but not disowning its flood or keeping separate from it. Those permanent opinions and principles, whether of philosophy, politics, or experience, which had proved by time and influence their title to respect, Christianity respected and adopted; or rather, let us say, harmonized with so entirely as to for ever establish their place. Whatever in pagan thought has shown itself most apt to crystallize the water of life, was doubtless just that in heathen philosophy which had a claim to the preserving power of the gospel. Whatever most readily absorbed and held the truth was clearly best entitled to hold it, and to be protected and nourished by it. It cannot therefore wholly content any serious and inquiring mind, in the examination of a theological opinion, to find merely that it is not expressly laid down in the New Testament. If it have vitality and attraction for the human mind, he must know the reason of it; for though it may not be gospel truth, it may be *very important* truth, and have a claim only second to absolute revelation on his respect and belief.

We have denied the New-Testament origin of the popular doctrine of the Trinity, and with equal truth might deny the purely pagan origin of it. But it was the pagan trinity of an eternal threeness in the origin and substance of things, adapted to the facts and persons of Christianity, which shaped at last the Church Trinity. Thus it was neither purely pagan nor purely Christian; but had, as it seems to us, just enough of both to make it a convenient and effective vehicle of an everlasting truth which will survive the vessel that brought it down. The Trinity, as a dogma of the Church, with all its contradiction, absurdity, and unintelligibility, we have long ago abandoned; and the Church universal certainly holds it in our day with a very loose and feeble grasp. That Jesus Christ is God in any sense whatever in which the Creator is God, we pronounce simply

incredible; that the Holy Spirit is a distinct person, we hold to be equally past belief; that there is any physical or intellectual equality between God and Christ, we cannot allow: but we have no objection whatever to acknowledging a trinity in the Godhead, though it is not the subject of revelation, but simply the manifest teaching of philosophy. That trinity is not the Church Trinity, but expresses and consists simply in the fact, that the divine nature, like the human nature which is its image, has three great attributes or dimensions, which exhaust its perfection, — life, wisdom, love; or will, intellect, affection; or truth, goodness, beauty. These considered as infinitely existing, in a conscious person, describe God; as finitely existing, in a conscious person, describe man. When you have pronounced the words “the true, the good, the beautiful,” or might, right, light, you have uttered an exhausting catalogue of spiritual life: you can add nothing which does not fall under one or the other of these heads. For evidently all things are either to be referred to the power of God, to the wisdom of God, or to the love of God. It is impossible for God to make any manifestation of himself, whether visible or invisible, in which one or another of his three great attributes does not appear more prominently than the others. Although in reality all of them are equally present in every thing, there is no manifestation of God’s power which does not involve his love and wisdom, nor any exhibition of his love which does not imply his power and wisdom, nor any exercise of his wisdom which does not require the co-operation of his love and his might; still we say the cataract and the sea image his power, the instincts of beasts and the vicissitudes of the seasons show his wisdom, the bounty of nature and the happiness of sentient creatures reflect his goodness.

Thus the threeness of God is always one, though its threefoldness is apparent as in turn one or the other of his three great attributes comes prominently into view. And we must not think this threefoldness fanciful, or that it is equally pertinent to speak of God’s four or five or seven foldness. Because we used to speak of four elements, — earth, air, fire,

and water,—and four quarters of the globe, and the four corners of the square, and because four is the first multiple of the first number capable of being multiplied into itself,—we do not therefore think of God as fourfold; or because we have the five fingers, and the five senses, and the five books of Moses, and the five divisions of the globe, and five is the half of the decimal,—we do not think of him as fivefold; or because seven is of all numbers the mystic number, with the seven days of the week, and the seven golden candlesticks, and the seven years of plenty and famine, and the seven sleepers, and the seven angels, and the seven thunders, and the seventy years of human life, and Daniel's seventy weeks,—we do not therefore think the Godhead sevenfold. These are fanciful and accidental numerations. But there is nothing fanciful or accidental in the threefoldness of God and man: it belongs to the necessary modes of thought, and cannot be got rid of. Philosophy begins its first page with the distinction,—the subject, the object, and the relation between them. Space can only be described by its three dimensions,—length, breadth, thickness. And God can be thought of only in his power, his wisdom, or his goodness. He is will, intellect, affection; or energy, wisdom, love; or truth, goodness, beauty; first fair, first good, first wise. There are, too, three kingdoms,—animal, mineral, and vegetable; three primary colors,—red, yellow, and blue; three chords,—thirds, fifths, eighths; three genders,—masculine, feminine, and neuter; three parties to the universe,—God, nature, man; three sources of knowledge,—intuition, experience, revelation; three kinds of force,—brute, intellectual, spiritual. In like manner, all things are in a threefold state, of action, reaction, rest: and there are three parts to every great institution or experience, whether it be youth, manhood, age; or beginning, middle, and end; or legislative, judicial, and executive; or autocratic, aristocratic, and democratic; as there are three states in one of which every thing must be,—active, passive, or neuter. “To do, to be, and to suffer” comprehends all possible actions, emotions, existences; past, present, and future,—all possible time. Such is

the triplicity that runs through God, nature, man ; and every main division of either is capable of being reduced to its three grand elements or distinctions.

It would be strange, indeed, if, with such a constitution of things, there should not be many trinities found in the Bible. Earth, heaven, and hell are one ; Old Testament, Apocrypha, and New Testament, another ; historical, prophetic, and practical books, another ; the three men that appeared to Abram on the plains of Mamre ; the three days our Lord lay in the grave ; the three things the prophet offered David ; the three times Elijah stretched himself on the dead child ; the threefold cord not quickly broken ; the three Marys ; the three graces, — faith, hope, charity ; the three blessings, — grace, mercy, and peace ; the three witnesses, — the spirit, the water, and the blood ; the three members of the scriptural form of baptism, — the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Nor is it to be denied, whether the text itself be genuine or not, that the doctrine of 1 John v. 7, is authentic : “ For there *are three* that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost ; and these three are one.”

God is here represented under his three characters of source, channel, stream ; original, mediator, and thing communicated ; sovereign, messenger, message. When God made man, he was his *Father* ; when he spoke to him by his Son, he was the Logos or *Word* ; when man understood him and received his message and gift, he was the Holy Ghost. And it is manifest, that as the fountain, the channel, and the stream make one river, and so in a certain sense, very circumscribed and intelligible, are *one* ; so God and Christ, the Word and the Holy Spirit, God’s inspiration and influence, are one and the same. But it is only when we choose to consider them as one and the same for certain purposes, that they are so. God and Christ are one ; but they are not exclusively one, any more than any other father and son are exclusively one. We uniformly speak of a family as one, having common interests, affections, and blood ; and each member, as in some respects competent to represent and act for the whole :

but we do not imagine, for an instant, that we are merging their characters or individualities in such a way as to deny their separate, distinct, and even dissimilar existence, or the inferiority and dependence of the children on the parents. When we consider Christ impersonally as the Word, we may call him God; just as when we consider a plenipotentiary as the country he represents, we may call him Russia or France. But when we begin to call Jesus himself God, we are violating all the proprieties of speech and all the proper boundaries of thought. In like manner, when we contemplate the Holy Spirit as God, we may properly personify it. The Holy Spirit is a person, because there is no Holy Spirit but God, who is a person; but what we deny is any *separate* person known as the Holy Spirit; and yet it is natural and convenient to speak of God's peculiar influence as a Saviour through his word by a distinct name, and in this manner the phrase the Holy Ghost has crept into use.

That which has made it necessary to protest against the Church Trinity is, that from a symbolical, poetic, and rhetorical phrase, appealing to the imagination and the heart, it has hardened into a numerical, scientific, and metaphysical dogma, insulting to common sense, perversive of Scripture, and hostile to freedom of religious thought and progress. Instead of a help towards a conception of the moral oneness of God and Christ and the holy influence still exerted upon the Church, it is a hindrance, confusing and mystifying the subject. From a message of light, it is converted into a mystery of darkness. To speak of Christ, as God by nature and essence and attributes, is to distract attention from that in which alone he is God,—in spirit, temper, authority, and office; and it is his being truly and properly man, with the functions of God bestowed upon him, that gives him his affecting and effectual interest for us. Suppose a king, disguised as his own minister, should go to some foreign court, and be received there in good faith under his assumed name: he would be treated with the respect due to his supposed master's throne. But would it answer for him to let it appear who he was? could there be any satisfactory treaty

made under such circumstances? Certainly not. Well, now, imagine him, having successfully accomplished his concealment, returning home, and declaring that the plenipotentiary he had passed himself off for at the congress was really the king himself, and asserting, that, while there, he had darkly claimed that character, and then quoting the high phrases of reverence and respect which had been paid him, as a royal representative, as evidence that his disguise had been penetrated by the discerning? Would it be considered an honest, dignified, and intelligible course of conduct? But this is what the Church Trinity supposes to have been done in Christ's case. God sends what appears to be his Son, what styles itself his Son, into the world, — the man Christ Jesus. He claims to be in the place of God to us, — to be his messenger, plenipotentiary, and representative, and uses such high language as serves to convey this idea. He dies and ascends to heaven; and then it is made to appear that this Son of God is God himself; this messenger, his own sender; and the high language used and originally understood of him only as due to a reflected dignity and glory, is claimed to be his in his own right, and to be entitled to its literal force; while the apostles, apparently venerating him in such warm and earnest terms as his personal character and miraculous office fully warranted, are now asserted to have intended and expressed the homage due only to the Supreme God!

Such a deception and perversion as this would condemn any merely human transaction; but the Church has plenary indulgence for pious frauds!

Undoubtedly, this false and preposterous claim of the Church has done a vast deal in modern times to weaken the true theory and sentiment of Christ's divinity. Hurrying away from the deity of Christ, the dissenters have asserted his ordinary humanity. Christ indeed was a man, but such a man as it takes to communicate the express image of God; — a man, but such as a man is when the Spirit of God is poured out upon him without measure; — a man, but a man raised up, inspired, and guided for the greatest of all objects, by the immediate hand of the Creator; — a man, but a man without

sin and without the imperfections and limitations of all other men. Such peculiarities make him divine in a sense in which no other created being is divine, as much above all prophets and apostles as he is above all common men; make him not unintelligible, but certainly in part of his nature unfathomable; make him an object by himself of special and peculiar homage and reverence,—not indeed of adoration and worship, but of such love and sacred sentiments of veneration as do not compromise that exclusive devotion due to that Supreme One who “alone heareth prayer.” Unhappily, the unscriptural and disloyal claims made for Christ as the true God, as the second person of the Trinity, make it almost impossible for us to use that language towards him which the heart prompts and the Scriptures warrant!

There is an honest and true sense in which Christ is God; Immanuel, the incarnation of God, God made visible, God seen in a man. It is the same sense in which the image in a mirror is the person it reflects. But suppose any one should insist upon treating the picture of a friend as he treated that friend himself,—of talking to it, bowing to it, and finally insisting it was his *very* friend: should we not be in favor of turning the picture to the wall, or sending it into the garret? And certainly it would not be because the likeness was not excellent, or because we had not the profoundest respect for the friend and the highest value for the picture. And so, in some degree, it has fared with Christ's divinity. Some Unitarians would be glad to call Christ God in a certain sense, if they were not fearful of being misunderstood; for nothing short of that word fully expresses their sense of his majesty, importance, and nearness to God. They remember that Moses was a God to the Egyptians; they remember our Saviour's own invincible defence of his innocency in using the title the Son of God: “Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods to whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?” But with the duty upon them of withstanding the

all but universal perversion of the supreme deity of Christ by the Church and the world, they are compelled to seem willing to abate something from the real dignity of the Saviour's name.

In like manner, the personality of the Holy Spirit is a lively figure which it would sometimes be grateful to use; but, in the present state of theology, it cannot be done by Unitarians without liability to mistake. Yet it would be a slander of the first magnitude to assert, that they make light of the Holy Spirit, which they constantly evoke, and to which indeed they attribute all that is spiritually to be attributed to God himself. The only flaw in the orthodox dogma of the Holy Ghost, is not in equalling it with God, or pronouncing it God, or ascribing personality to it; but in making it any thing *but* God, — in ascribing, in short, *separateness* of personality to it.

Finally, if threeness in the very constitution of the mind, of nature, and of God, accounts both for what is real and what is unreal in the Trinity, — for its origin and for the singular vitality of the Church dogma, which has so little foundation in Scripture itself, — let us remind ourselves that the distinctive faith of Unitarians is founded upon a still more radical, permanent, and significant numerical principle, and that is *oneness*. If the Church dogma had only adhered practically to its original starting-place, or even its verbal formula of *trinity in unity*, it would have held essential and innocent, not to say useful, truth; but it rapidly degenerated into unity in trinity. Instead of the Triune God, we have had the *One-three* God; that is to say, chief attention has fastened, not where it belonged, on the unity, but on the trinity. What greater and more fundamental idea of unity can there be, than unipersonality? or what more revolutionary assault upon the unity of God than his supposed existence in three distinct *persons*? Is it in the power of the human mind to consider God as three persons, enjoying heavenly society, and in eternal agreement, and yet as after all only one God? And when we come to give to these three persons, not merely different names and different functions, but

opposite and contending functions; so that they have bargains and purchases and arguments and covenants; and one can do what the other cannot; one can be angry, and the other plead for mercy; one resolve to punish, and the other interpose; one sit upon the throne, and the other die upon the cross,—is it not inevitable that the separateness and threeness will and must triumph over the union and oneness? As a necessary consequence, the effort to return to unity, which is an irresistible proclivity of the human intellect, has been accomplished by Trinitarians at the expense of God the Father and God the Holy Ghost; *i.e.*, by a practical elevation of Jesus Christ to the moral throne of the universe. Christ is not only God to the Trinitarian; but he is more God than is the Creator of the universe himself!—more beloved, confided in, trusted to, worshipped, and praised. This is not to be said in disparagement of Trinitarian Christians, but only in criticism of their necessary drift. And what is the effect of making Christ God,—the Christian's God, the God and Saviour of the soul? Why, there must be another God, the sustainer and upholder of the material universe, the First Cause, the administrator of natural laws, the God of science, whom few intelligent Trinitarians would be willing to call Christ? Thus Jesus Christ is the Church God, and the Creator is the God of the universe; and in this manner Nature and the God of Nature are in a manner put out of the Church, unevangelized, and with them the vast majority of human souls. It is because the unity of God, rescued by instinct from tritheism, has practically sunk into a sole interest in Christ, that theology has grown so narrow, nature so godless, science so heathenish, and life so undevout. The few who accept the Church God, Jesus Christ, have a spasmodic, narrow, and fanatical faith in God; the many who reject him are cast upon the cold mercies of a natural religion, which the Church has pronounced and made profane.

How to reinstate the Creator of the universe in the worship of the Church; how to make the God of nature the God of the private soul; how to make science and philosophy evangelical,—is the problem of the age and the work

of Unitarian theologians. It cannot be done, until Jesus Christ, the Son of God, ceases to be lifted into his Father's seat. His derived, dependent, created, and secondary nature and place must be tenderly and reverently assigned him; and the heart of Christendom must be content with that allotment before we can hope to see the great mass of thoughtful, scientific, earnest minds able to believe in the gospel or to worship God through his Son. So long as Christ is supposed to reveal himself as God, his office will be deemed an interested, an incredible, or an unscientific one. But when it is distinctly understood that he aims not to reveal *himself*, but his *Father*, then naturalists and philosophers — and who are not joining that class? — will be ready to add to that imperfect moral and spiritual knowledge of God, derived through the things he has made, that better and more affecting knowledge of him which comes only through faith in his Son.

One day justice will be done to the causes which have produced, and the effects which have attended, the theological movement known as Unitarianism. It is not a petty criticism of texts, a little dispute of sectarists, but a great movement, comparatively just begun, of the human mind. It may take two or three centuries of protest and criticism to undo the work of fifteen centuries of Church dogmatism. And the beginners will blunder, and do some harm, with much good, and meanwhile miss the fragrance of the old cedars that have grown up around the temples where Jesus Christ is worshipped. It is a dear and sacred error, if it be one, that Jesus Christ is God; and tender are the affections and powerful the influences still proceeding from that tangible, definite, and personal faith. But it is not dearer than the Jew's old and false hope, which after centuries was torn from him; not dearer than the Catholic's Virgin, which the world cannot permit him longer to worship; not dearer than many errors which the undying necessities of truth have expelled from the affections and intellects of the world. If Christ is not God, then he must not be called God, nor worshipped as God, not be suffered to stand in the place of God. For the

truth alone is safe and wholesome; the truth alone can save the world.

Something hinders and stays the progress and influence of the gospel; something produces infidelity and atheism among good men; something is sapping the foundations of faith in Scripture, in Christ, in God. Is it not *error* that is doing this, — false theology, presumptuous confidence in what is merely old and established? Because the world cannot easily surmount it, it turns aside from theology altogether; and, deserting theology, ends with deserting the gospel itself. This is the source of the cry: "Away with doctrine, religion is a spirit; away with form, religion is a temper," — a cry which causes most of the religious ignorance and apathy of the generation now upon the stage.

This, too, is the indirect cause of the occasional revulsion of devout minds in our own ranks towards the very error we came into being to overthrow. Weary with waiting for the world's adhesion, longing for larger fraternity, needing a warmer and more personal faith, — they are drawn in their weakness to the strange fire they were born to extinguish, and cease to tend the precious flame that so long refuses to kindle. But where is our patience and faith? Are we the only heirs of God's truth that cannot wait for their legitimacy to be recognized? When was a great theological reform carried in a half-century? We are like the Reformers before the Reformers. Our Luther, our Reformation, has not come. But not less certain of victory, not less persuaded of the vast importance of the controversy, ought we to be than John when he baptized Jesus, or Huss when he anticipated Luther, or Priestley when he preceded Channing. The unity of God, the worship of the Father, is the most practical and potent article of that Church of the Future which we predict and wait for; the worship of Christ, the Church dogma of the Trinity, the main obstacle to the spread and efficacy of the gospel now, and from this time forth, till it is by God's help driven from the creed of Christendom.

ART. VIII. — REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

THE translation of the New Testament, by Dr. Noyes,* will be welcomed with tender interest by all who loved and honored its venerable author. On this work, Dr. Noyes labored almost till his death, consulting, during his last illness, with his friend Mr. Abbot, on the revision of the proof-sheets, and at times giving warm expression to his interest in the task, and his delight in the sacred writings he was illustrating. What he was not permitted to accomplish, has been well done by the accurate scholar who assisted him. Mr. Abbot, besides revising the remaining proof-sheets, has added some brief but valuable notes, — as on pages 441, 473, 493, 527, — and appended a list of the alterations made by Tischendorf in the lately published portion of his eighth critical edition. We were at first tempted to regret that this had not appeared soon enough for Dr. Noyes to restore, upon its authority, the common reading at least of John i. 18, and reject the strange expression, “the only begotten God.” But it is better as it is; for the passage stands a monument of the translator’s superiority to sectarian feeling, and of his strict adherence to the text he had announced as his guide. The comparative claims of the two readings have been well presented by Mr. Abbot, in the Appendix to Norton’s “Statement of Reasons,” and in the “Bibliotheca Sacra” for October, 1861.

The merit of Dr. Noyes’s translation will, we trust, be fully examined and correctly stated by some one competent for the task, in another number of this periodical. Our first impression, which is all that can now be given, is highly favorable, alike on the score of correctness and on that of good taste. We have examined it in some passages side by side with other versions, particularly Wakefield’s, and that of the “Four Gospels” by Professor Norton; and if we are not yet prepared to give it a decided preference over the works of those accomplished scholars, yet it seems to us much, that, while it vies with them in other respects, it differs less than they from the

* The New Testament. Translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf, by GEORGE R. NOYES, D.D., Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages, and Dexter Lecturer on Biblical Literature, in Harvard University. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1869.

phraseology of the venerable English Bible. Some will probably lay down the book in disappointment, on this very account; but in our judgment the translator was right in retaining all that he conscientiously could, of the words hallowed by long use and dear and sacred association.

It may be of interest to observe how some of the passages most frequently referred to in controversy appear, in the version of Dr. Noyes, from the text of Tischendorf.

John i. 1-14, is rendered substantially as in the common version; as is also John xx. 29.

Acts xx. 28: "Take heed therefore . . . to feed the church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Colossians ii. 2, 3: "To the full knowledge of the mystery of God; in which are stored up all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

1 Timothy iii. 16: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness, in him who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory."

1 John v. 6-8: "This is he who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood; and the Spirit is that which beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one."

1 John v. 20: "And we know that the Son of God hath come, and hath given us understanding, that we may know the True One; and we are in the True One, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and everlasting life."

S. G. B.

THE resolute and high-tempered professor who has stood long at the head of one, at least, if not of all, schools of Hebrew criticism, has won other than scholastic laurels lately, by maintaining his ground stanchly and successfully under political prosecution, — as zealous in his Hanoverian patriotism against the absorbing centralism of Prussia, as in the defence of his own order of opinion against hostile critics. The second volume of his history,* with the general characteristics we have before noticed in the first,† has the advantage that it is clear of

* The History of Israel. By HEINRICH EWALD, Professor of the University of Göttingen. Translated from the German. Edited, with a Preface and Appendix, by RUSSELL MARTINEAU. Vol. II. Joshua and the Judges. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 8vo, pp. 222.

† See *Christian Examiner* for May, 1868.

the wide ground of preliminary dissertation, and is all on the track of intelligible story. It has the advantage, too, of a glowing and idealizing narrative of times which show to the common eye little else than a gaunt and pitiless realism. But it has the disadvantage to balance, that its topic is less grand, its materials are less orderly and compact, its chronology is even more broken and confused. Besides, the daring, confident, opinionated temper of Ewald's intellect is better adapted to the task of shaping materials out of the wide wild waste, and constructing his theories in a field where all conjecture is alike legitimate, and where his wealth of erudition and his divining eye have amplest play, than it is where the conditions are more strictly limited, and the field is narrowed down. There is somehow a sense of superfluous effort, and a mind disdainful of sober bounds, in the detail of these very instructive chapters on the Judges. It is, in one sense, the *determining* period of Hebrew history for the critics. Whether the Mosaic institutions, in any thing like the shape we know of them, were in force; whether any genuine literary remains have come down to us from this period; whether there was any thing like an organized hierarchy, a settled government, and a consecutive chronology, — are the cardinal points on which our whole notion of "Joshua and the Judges" turns.

These are the points on which we have a right to expect the maturest judgment, the ripest scholarship, and the fullest argument of such an historian as Ewald. Naturally, we are disappointed and vexed, when we find all critical judgment upon them forestalled by four pages of such postulates as these: "*There is no doubt that Joshua, during the first years of the entrance into Canaan, subdued the country on every side, and received the submission of the Canaanites.*" But this rapidity "*must have operated rather injuriously,*" since "*the real rule of Joshua must have seemed concluded,*" and the duty of his resigning his authority "*would not be questioned.*" That he "*would strain every nerve*" to carry out the purpose which Moses had bequeathed to him, "*may be taken for granted.*" The partition of the conquered territory "*must at this time have been carried out.*" Arrangements for national union "*must have been made.*" Its President "*must be the High-Priest.*" There "*must be the possibility of final appeal*" to the Oracle, which, "*of course, was in the hands of the high-priest.*" The Tabernacle "*must be transferred*" from Gilgal to Shiloh. "*Many institutions, especially ceremonial, must have been created at this period.*" Flesh sacrifices, &c., "*were undoubtedly then*

prescribed." The appointment of the Levitical order "was only consistent with this history;" and the assignment of forty-eight Levitical cities "must belong to the time of Joshua." At this time, too, "many customs certainly first received proper legal sanction." "Thus, about this time, the constitution of the community, begun by Moses, must have been completed in all those important regulations which we see maintained through succeeding ages with unshaken firmness." (pp. 30-34.)

This is building history, as an unskilful general digs his entrenchments, "in the air:" it is the language of a theologian or a metaphysician, not of a critic. A student, seeking satisfaction by argument, is obliged to content himself with mere assertions and "must-have-beens." The theory we have quoted, not only determines the whole conception of the history, but is assumed and elaborately carried out in Ewald's "Alterthümer," a work of astonishing learning, interest, and ability, embodying in detail his theory of the Mosaic institutions, — which we wish might be translated as a companion to this volume. Yet it is so far from being firmly grasped and distinctly realized under the conditions which the history itself imposes, that, almost in the next page after those we have cited, we are told of the scattered and imperilled situation of the conquerors, — near two millions in a district smaller than Massachusetts! — occupying the broken highlands, amidst powerful hostile populations which held the more spacious lowlands, "like quaking islands in a stormy sea;" while the disorders that fill almost the whole narrative make his conception of the theocracy, to say the least, a most violent improbability. In fact, after diligently studying and accepting this theory of the history, one may after all be led (mainly by the work of Ewald himself) to the conviction, that the "theocracy," properly speaking, was the ideal creation of very much later times, and was never realized in fact; that the priesthood and kindred institutions grew up along with the centralized monarchy of Solomon and his successors; and that the shapely, coherent, elaborate picture of them, given in "Leviticus," and wrought out with such remarkable skill in Ewald's own work, was the dream of that Jewish Puritanism which followed the labors of Ezra, and was only reflected back upon the curtain of a far-distant past. And this view, we think, holds the stronger ground to-day.

It is a great flaw in a production so faithful, scholarly, and indispensable, that it is written in the temper of an idealist, a theologian,

and a dogmatist. While the earliest relics and traditions are put into shape with singular vigor and constructive skill, this border ground between them and authentic history is pre-occupied by unlikely theories and uncritical assertions. Once warned of this, the reader will not fail to find abundant instruction and pleasure in the volume, without the disappointment that is sure to follow if he attempts to grasp and sustain the writer's conception as a whole. J. H. A.

EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ is, in the Protestant Church of France, what Frederic Maurice is in the Church of England, a mediator between orthodoxy and rationalism; in sympathy with the spirit of the age, while he holds on to the traditions of the faith. Some of his critical opinions are dangerously lax, but he balances these by other opinions which seem strangely superstitious. You cannot tell exactly where he is, — he is now here, and now there; and his style (though far clearer and more pointed than the style of the English "veil-maker," who covers all his ideas with a haze of verbiage) is yet rather a non-committal, than a positive, style.

This equivocal position appears in all the works of De Pressensé, but in none more than in his "Life of Jesus," * a translation of which has recently appeared. The translation is fairly good, but, sometimes, preserves too much of the French idiom to appear well in an English dress. The "*je ne sais quoi*" is not good English, when literally rendered.

By far the most valuable part of the book is the first half, which is preliminary, and treats of the Pagan religions, the various sects, parties, and doctrines of Judaism, and the sources of the history of Jesus Christ. In this part, the author is often at one with Nicolas and the radical critics. He differs from them, however, in his views of the origin and authenticity of the Gospels, in holding that they were all products of the first century, and written by the persons whose names they bear. He finds no sound reason for denying that John the apostle was the author of the Fourth Gospel. Yet he makes much more account in their narration of the aid which memories and traditions gave them, than of any assistance which they had from the Holy Spirit. The advocates of plenary inspiration in the evangelical histories will find no comfort in Pressensé's *prolegomena*.

* Jesus Christ. His Times, Life, and Work. By E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D. Second edition, revised. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Co., 1868. 12mo., pp. xx, 496.

The Gospels are human compositions, with the errors, too, of human compositions, as much as the narratives of the Pagan historians. We may differ from the writer's conclusions, but the argument by which they are reached is fair and rational.

The closing chapter of the Introduction, on the "Doctrinal Bases of the Life of Jesus," will spoil for many the apparent conservatism of the critical opinions. Pressensé holds to the divinity of Christ, and to the Incarnation; but he expressly denies that the man Jesus was more by constitution than other men, that he had the omniscience or the omnipotence of God. "As a man, his knowledge and his power were limited." His growth and development were human, and he was subject to the ordinary laws of humanity. In writing the "Life of Jesus," he is not writing about the *logos*, the creator of the world, but about the Jewish son of Mary, who was born, educated, and influenced like other Jewish children. Pressensé writes only the life of a wonderful man, who had rare knowledge, and a singular command over the forces of nature, which enabled him to suspend and control the ordinary laws of matter.

In the second and larger half of the volume, the story of Jesus is told rather in sketches than as connected and graphic narrative. It is not fanciful, like the brilliant romance of Renan; it is not nicely critical, as in Strauss's examination. But it touches the salient points, and dwells upon those which are most interesting. The disquisition of this part of the work is unexceptionable in sentiment, and some of it is touching and beautiful. Other statements are strangely unscientific. Pressensé not only thinks that Jesus may have shared the ideas of his own time about demoniac possessions, but is inclined to believe now that the disease of insanity is the sign of indwelling devils. He explains the Temptation of Jesus as a psychological process, yet has no objection to an actual devil who suggests its ways. He seems to accept the legend of the song to the shepherds, and the adoration of the magi, as literal history; but he does not commit himself to the story of the miraculous conception, or make it of any importance in the life of Jesus that he had no human father. He believes, certainly, that Mary had other children born in the natural way. That Jesus had any foreknowledge of modern science or was in advance of his age on questions of physics, Pressensé denies; yet he thinks it absurd to suppose that Jesus shared "the childish notions of his age about the marvellous." One of the least satisfactory chapters of the book is the short chapter on "The Miracles of Jesus

Christ." It will not satisfy those who regard them as signs of omnipotence, nor, on the other hand, those who believe that they were wrought by the power of faith. Pressensé's position here is a middle position.

It seems fated that every doctor of theology shall, in our time, try his hand upon a life of Jesus. Thus far, no book has been written that has added much to the fragmentary narratives of the four Gospels, or has fairly discredited these. A faithful study of these narratives gives a more positive picture of the fortunes and character of the man of Nazareth than any of these larger "improvements, alterations, and additions." A work is in preparation in Germany, if it has not already been published, which professes to construct a life of Jesus from the Apocryphal Gospels and legends, leaving out the canonical Gospels altogether. Such a work will have value as a satire on the futile attempts to correct and rectify the evangelical histories.

C. H. B.

MISCELLANEOUS.

It would seem rather an ungracious thing to criticise with severity — especially since his death — the work to which a most estimable man has devoted a long life and powers of no mean order ; and we gladly recognize, that the first volume of Mr. Dean's "*History of Civilization*" * gives a clear and generally accurate view of the civilization of remote antiquity. As a kind of Universal History, in which the religion, industry, and life of a nation, receive the prominence which is wholly given to wars and dynasties, it may occupy a respectable position ; but a history of civilization, in the highest sense of the word, it is not. The *statics* of civilization, if we may use the expression, are amply discussed ; but the *dynamics* receive hardly a word. These elaborate chapters on the several aspects of the national life in each of the great nations of the East are very good materials, but cannot be accepted as a finished product.

Even as materials, however, they will disappoint the student, mainly for the reason that he is, at almost all points, left in doubt whether he has before him the results of the best and latest investigations, — or rather he knows for a certainty that he has not. We are told in the preface, that the author was accustomed to purchase new

* The History of Civilization. By AMOS DEAN, LL.D. In seven volumes. Vol. I. Albany, N. Y. : Joel Munsell, 1868. 8vo, pp. 695.

works, as they appeared, throwing light on the periods that he had already treated; and that he spent three years in revising the work after it was finished. But he would appear to have had no knowledge of the continental languages, for all his authorities are English; from which it follows that the different portions of the work possess very different degrees of authority. For the chief Asiatic nations, he was fortunate in possessing, in Rawlinson's great work, the latest results of scholarship; for the rest, his standard authorities are Prichard, Bunsen, Wilkinson (for Egypt), Gibbon, Anquetil and "Universal History,"—hardly a sign of Lepsius and his fellow-workers in Egyptology, no mention of Ewald's "Volk Israel" or Movers' "Phönizer."

Even in English authorities, we find unaccountable omissions. Thus, he accepts the views of Max Müller in his first course of lectures on the Science of Language, and copies them in some detail; but not only pays no attention to Professor Whitney's work, in which Müller's theory is, as we think, satisfactorily refuted, but does not even seem to be acquainted with Müller's second series, which furnishes so rich material for a history of civilization, in its chapters on Comparative Mythology. Of this latter science indeed, Mr. Dean seems to have had not even an inkling; as, for example, he gives a page or two (p. 663) to the myth of Adonis, comparing it, to be sure, with that of Osiris, but just as a story,—not alluding to its symbolic meaning, although it is, perhaps, the best ascertained interpretation in the whole range of mythology. Again, in regard to the pyramids (p. 420), the best authority he can find is *Gliddon*; having apparently never heard of *Piazzi Smyth*.

Nothing indeed is more remarkable than Mr. Dean's use of his authorities. He gravely quotes the "American Phrenological Journal," p. 24, to the effect that the English *virgin* is a compound of the Latin *vir*, and the Chinese *gin*, both meaning *man*! It is evident, that, if Mr. Dean had read Müller's "Lectures on Language," he had swallowed them whole, without digestion; for no person who had the smallest comprehension of linguistic principles could have seized upon such a ridiculous piece of etymology as this. So, too, the "London Quarterly Review" is quoted, p. 691, in support of the innocent statement that the Lydians *probably* reclined at their meals.

Mr. Dean, of course, finds the trinity in the triads of Indian deities as well as in the Elohim of the first book of Genesis. It is singular, if the Hindoos and the Greeks of Homer's time (as Mr. Gladstone

deduces from the frequent recurrence of the combined names of Zeus, Apollo, and Athene) had a knowledge of this doctrine, — it is singular, we say, that the Jews, the chosen people, were permitted to forget it, and wait until two or three centuries after Christ for its rediscovery.

It will sufficiently appear, from the above, what the real character of this ambitious book is. It is not a history of the development of civilization, but a sketch of ancient history, — often very well done in detail, but with no adequate appreciation of the requirements of historical composition. Especially, the author seems to have been ignorant that it is the very earliest times in regard to which we are making the most rapid advance in knowledge, and therefore must be most particular to have the latest authority. Of course, any such book as that before us must be a compilation: it is not to be criticised for this. But whence to compile is a question that increases in difficulty as we go back in time. It is very well in modern history to follow current authorities; it requires rather more caution in the middle ages; it is not at all safe in Greece and Rome: but in Egypt and Asia it is fatal to all claims to accuracy.

W. F. A.

It is very rare for a dragoman to appear in literature: still rarer for him to contribute any thing of lasting value to the literature of the world. But this worthy official at the United States Legation in Constantinople has gathered a heap of curious information upon an exceedingly curious subject. Every Oriental traveller becomes acquainted with two classes of Dervishes, the Howling and the Dancing. He easily learns as much as this, that they are Moslem monks of reputed sanctity, severe self-denial, professed piety, and intense fanaticism: their name meaning, in Persian, the sill of a door; that is, humility. With this, and a sight of each of their peculiar exercises, he supposes that he has sucked the orange and may throw the peel away. But our official mouthpiece, living in a city containing more than fifty dervish convents, has thrown together without much system all that general readers can desire: * a history and description of twelve of those monastic orders, which enjoy nearly equal reputation, and receive a like support from the alms of the faithful through all the Ottoman Empire.

It is evident that there are as distinct orders among dervishes as

* The Dervishes; or, Oriental Spiritualism. By JOHN P. BROWN. London: Trubner & Co.

among friars: distinct in dress, in worship, in manner of life, in origin; though they sometimes unite in public devotion, lead generally a conventual life, and pay the same implicit obedience to their Sheikh. Their spiritualism, as exhibited by Mr. Brown, is chiefly the history of a magnetic influence exercised by certain Sheikhs, not only over men but animals, bringing them under such control that the violent are tame and the poisonous harmless, and producing fits of unconsciousness in human beings. Though our dragoman gives the usual instances of the imposture of drawing out snakes from chamber walls, and deceiving the spectator's eyes by unreal wounds, as is still done at the return from Mecca, he does not show what we had expected upon the decay of the whole system,—the disgust of the Moslem public, the intoxication of leading performers, the palsied state of this Right Arm of Moslemism. He traces the origin of the institution to the injunctions of poverty, contemplation, humility, and charity in the Koran; but far more just to the presence of Monasticism in all Asia during many ages to refer it to principles of human nature favored by that climate, and sustained by habits of life, indigenous to the very soil.

F. W. H.

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

Greater Britain: a Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries during 1866 and 1867. By Charles Wentworth Dilke. With maps and illustrations. 12mo, 561 pp. — The Old World in its New Face. Impressions of Europe in 1867-1868. By Henry W. Bellows. Vol. II. 12mo, pp. 528. — Jesus of Nazareth: His Life and Teachings. Founded on the Four Gospels. By Lyman Abbott. 12mo, pp. 520. — Nature's Nobleman. By the author of "Rachel's Secret." 8vo, pp. 144. — Cast Up by the Sea. By Sir Samuel W. Baker. Illustrated by Huard. 12mo, pp. 419. — China and the Chinese. By Rev. John L. Nevias, ten years a missionary in China. 12mo, pp. 456. — Travel and Adventure in the Territory of Alaska. By Frederick Whymper. 12mo, pp. 350. — Poetical Works of Charles G. Halpine (Miles O'Reilly). Edited by Robert B. Roosevelt. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo, pp. 345.

The Conscript: a Story of the French War of 1813. By William Erckmann Chatnan. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 12mo, pp. 330.

Dolores: a Tale of Disappointment and Distress. Arranged from Journal, &c., of Roland Vernon, Esq. By Benjamin Robinson. New York: E. J. Hale & Sons. 8vo, pp. 180.

The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and Lyrical Poems in the English Language; selected and arranged, with Notes, by Francis Turner Palgrave. pp. 405. — Arne: a Sketch of Norwegian Country Life. By Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson. Translated from the Norwegian. By Augusta Plesner & S. Rugelly Powers. Boston & Cambridge: Sever, Francis, & Co., pp. 150. (This edition of the "Golden Treasury" is printed from the same plates with the former issue of this choice and favorite collection; and at a price which makes it one of the cheapest, as well as unquestionably the best, in its kind.)